VOLUME VIII JANUARY, 1913 NUMBER 1

THE FUTURE OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE.

IF in some future time a literary historian attempts to estimate the critical output of these last fifty years, he will find his task to be a labour of Hercules. He will be able at once to single out a few prominent figures such as Sainte-Beuve, Taine, Matthew Arnold, Brunetière, Faguet and Benedetto Croce, and he will easily understand and explain their messages. But he will also notice that these thinkers have had comparatively few followers, and that hundreds and hundreds of other workers in literature have sprung up, mostly in the Universities, with quite different aims and methods. He will readily recognise that these academic men—and women—of research have done a vast amount of valuable work; that they have cleared up obscure questions, annotated and reprinted obscure authors, systematised and tabulated obscure periods, each contributing his own piece of masonry to a vast edifice of learning. But when he enquires what common bond united all these scholars and to what common goal all these efforts were directed, he will search long and in vain for a sufficiently convincing reply. This question, which a future historian is bound to put, we cannot help asking now. After all, to what purpose is all this minute knowledge of literature? Much of it has obviously and clearly no purpose at all, and runs riot almost as wildly as did the post-Augustan Virgilians or some of the seventeenth century scholars; so that able men devote toilsome years to the discovery of quaint and curious details which they vaguely declare to be important, without saying why. Can all this erudition be put to any ulterior and nobler use, or must most of it lose its vitality as soon as created? The present writer believes that the 'voluminous and vast' body of knowledge, which has now been made so easily accessible, can be coordinated and interpreted in a way impossible half a century ago. He believes that a subtler and higher kind of knowledge can be extracted from it by a method rather inadequately designated as that of Comparative Literature.

To understand the possibilities of comparative literature it is necessary to see in what relation it stands to the present tendencies of research. Owing to the strenuous competition for academic emoluments, many advanced students are guided in their labours by no other ideal than that of a higher position or an increased salary. But wherever a scholarly and intellectual purpose can be detected, it is generally this—to enable others to view some fragment of literature with the same eyes as the specialist. The uninitiated reader looks upon a play, a poem, an essay or a novel much as the man in the street will soon look upon aeroplanes. It is there because it is there. The man of letters realises that a masterpiece is not only an aesthetic pleasure but a triumph of inventiveness for those who know the history of its type. He also perceives that the great books of the past were written for readers with different ideas and surroundings and sometimes with a different idiom from our own, and that much of their thought and style can be appreciated only when this atmosphere is recreated. Again, while performing his task of classification and appreciation, he finds that some classic has really borrowed the ideas and even the phrasing of another writer, perhaps of a different age or country, and must be stripped of his borrowed plumes. Thus the critic is really an artist, not necessarily of words but of facts. Whether he is studying an author, an age or the history of a type of literature, he has to gather together a mass of sometimes apparently incongruous knowledge, often penetrating far into other ages and languages or digressing into history, economics, sociology and art, and he weaves all this learning round his theme, till it stands out in a new garb. It is obvious that in such a scheme of study there can be no place for comparative literature. Every advanced worker in the most restricted field is himself a student who compares. To add to this programme a comprehensive history of 'influences' and parallels would be merely to authorise a sciolist to attempt what is now achieved by an army of specialists.

It was this misdirection of energy and erudition against which Professor Gregory Smith, though for other reasons, warned the first readers of *The Modern Language Review* in 'Some Notes on the Comparative Study of Literature,' urging that this method, as usually applied, was a desiccated perversion, interesting only to scientists and antiquarians, whereas the true scope of such synthetic study would be found in the positive side of criticism, in discovering 'what Aristotle taught us to understand by the Universal in literary art.' Few broad-minded students are likely to disagree with Professor Gregory Smith,

as far as he goes. Undoubtedly one of the functions of comparative literature will be to emphasise what is fundamental and common 'in the history of *motif* and form.' But does he go far enough? Besides 'mere Darwinism' or 'the analogies which an unreasonably scientific age borrows so readily from the weather bureau or the physical laboratory,' the genesis of books has a philosophy peculiar to itself. We have, of course, long recognised that literature is a part of a nation's life and often indicates more clearly than laws or treaties or revolutions the trend of a people's mind. But quite apart from, or only half associated with this historical significance, it should be possible to investigate and explain the forces and influences which, in different epochs, bring different *genres* into existence. It is only by a method of comparative study—though not the method justly censured by Professor Smith—that the enquirer can win access to these secrets.

It may well be urged that the achievements of comparative literature, painstaking and valuable as such work undoubtedly is, are far from justifying such pretensions. Such a contention is only too true because, up till now, comparative literature has generally concerned itself only with resemblances and parallels. But if the student were to turn his attention to differences and contrasts, he would be amazed to find how quickly his researches were leading him behind the scenes. Why did the essay, which sprang into a sudden and glorious existence in France, die out of that country almost immediately afterwards and thrive and multiply for over three centuries among the English? And, in revenge, what caused the French to look to England, in spite of Rousseau, for romantic inspiration, and then so rapidly and splendidly to develop an artistic ideal of their own? Why has oratory flourished as a literary type during only four periods of European history, with Demosthenes, with Cicero, with Bossuet and with Burke? How was it that Greece created a certain kind of epic, that a Roman took that epic as the model for a similar poem, that then an Englishman drew inspiration from both, and yet that each one (assuming for convenience sake that Homer existed) produced something essentially different from the others? And how was it that after Homer only Virgil, Milton and, in a less degree, Dante caught the epic spirit, while so many other gifted poets from Lucan to Morris failed? Again, how was it that antiquity created a certain type of drama, that England and France accepted this model in the sixteenth century, blended it with their miracle plays, and yet produced a literature so fundamentally different each from the other? How was it that both countries produced their best drama in the

seventeenth and not in any other century, while Italy failed to produce any first-rate work and Germany, drawing on the same sources of inspiration, produced yet another type of drama, and that too in the eighteenth century? Then as a contrast turn to the Roman *satura*. It differs from other types of Latin literature in being of native origin. Again it differs in being profoundly modified by the Romans themselves, first by Lucilius, then by Horace and then by Juvenal. Yet in northern and modern Europe, unlike the drama and the epic, it retains, beneath superficial changes, the spirit of the old classics, and again, unlike the drama and the epic, it is completely effaced in the nineteenth century by the novel and the short story. How was it that the Renascence in Italy found vent in an assertion of individuality, while in France, the pupil of Italy, it subjected itself to law? Why did lyric poetry spring into a short and imperfect existence in Greece, an even less perfect existence at Rome, and then, after fitful and timorous efforts in medieval Latin and one short if glorious outburst at the Renascence, find full and free scope only in the nineteenth century? Why was it the eighteenth century, in which sentimentality first really made its presence to be felt? Or take the idea of the Devil and the idea of a Gentleman, which run like threads through post-classical civilisation. Of course an exhaustive antiquarian enquiry into these two conceptions would be beyond the most prodigally comprehensive scheme of literary research, but a comparative study of how each idea changes as one age succeeds the other is like reading a picture history of moral and social development.

These are a few examples, chosen almost haphazard, of the riddles which present themselves for solution as soon as the student begins to *compare* literatures. In compiling such a list it is hard to avoid debateable ground and a critical reader will undoubtedly shake his head at incidental assertions, which lack of space compels the writer to state with dogmatic brevity. But very few will deny the suggestiveness of the principle. In fact, most will go so far as to point out that such a method has long been recognised, and up to a certain degree has been put into practice. It would readily be conceded, for instance, that the Marprelate controversy can be understood more clearly by comparison with the *Satire Ménippée*; that Pope should be read side by side with Horace and Boileau; that Racine will suddenly stand in a new and fuller light when his *Iphigénie* is compared with the *Iphigenia* of Euripides, and then with that of Goethe; that Montaigne's *Institution des Enfants* will, by contrast, illuminate Ascham's *Scholemaster*, and

that Faret's *Honnête Homme* will do the same for Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman*. All this and far more will be conceded, and it will furthermore be pointed out that such comparisons do not merely trace the influence of one author or the indebtedness of another, but bring out the peculiarity or significance of a work as one shade of colour is heightened when compared with another. To this extent the comparative method is certainly far from new, but while it is applied only in this fragmentary way, to throw light on some specialist's subject, it is not a department of study but an obvious resource for any well-read and conscientious monographer. The real value of comparative literature can be appreciated only in the hands of some scholar who has no special author or period in mind, nor any desire to 'give a bird's eye view of the whole field,' but whose curiosity is excited by the strange contrasts and deviations of literary development. Such an enquirer will not dream of covering Europe's output in prose and poetry, but will concentrate his attention, almost instinctively, on those authors and schools of expression which, at any time or in any place, have unexpectedly differed. Not being distracted by any of the specialist's interests, though availing himself largely of his labours, he will pass from one author to another, wherever contrasts suggest an opening, first of all estimating the art and ideas of the works momentarily in question, then examining the *milieu* which shaped each literary life, then enquiring into the causes, whether social, domestic, racial, climatic or political which turned them severally from one trend of thought and one form of expression and drew them to another. By and bye, as he gradually learns what influences count in the formation of thought and what other influences, though considerable in history or sociology, are powerless, and again what qualities are essential to a particular type of literature, while certain other qualities are accidents of time and place, his apparently erratic footsteps begin to progress along definite lines. He finds that while avoiding the bibliographical and textual minuteness of the specialists, he has himself become a specialist of another sort, who supplements their discoveries by researches just as recondite. His chosen province is neither aesthetics nor biography, but the study of literary essence and evolution. Books to him are so much data for investigating the conditions which inspire and the conditions which diversify the written word.

It will readily be granted that no single literature can give the full materials for such an enquiry, and some will contend that all the

materials of all the literatures will never enable the student to arrive at anything but a half result. They will urge that such a method, however comprehensive, necessarily confines itself to the study of periods and tendencies, and overlooks the inexplicable but predominant personal element. Literary inspiration, they will add, like the wind, 'bloweth where it listeth,' the greatest intellectual movements are controlled by accidents of temperament or circumstance, and can often be traced to an obscure idiosyncrasy lurking in the brain of some genius. Thus any attempt at a concordance of literary tendencies must end in something academic and artificial. In reply to such objections it must certainly be admitted that all literary research is restricted in its range. Books are only one of the many products of the human mind and give an attenuated insight into its labyrinthine depths. But within the limits inevitably set to this source of knowledge, the comparative method will penetrate further towards fundamental truths than any specialised enquiry can do. To begin with, it is only by some such process that the personal element can be distinguished from the influences of environment, and again, it is only by the same means that the student can see how far-reaching these influences are. So imitative is the human mind, and so impressionable the creative faculty, that every author, even the most self-centred and secluded, produces his works in collaboration with all those whom he has read or who will read him. So although much in the genesis of human thought will always be a mystery, even more can be explained.

Let us attempt in a rough and conjectural outline, to sketch the method of an enquirer who is endeavouring to construct the laws of literary production. After all, the only effectual advocacy in these matters is by demonstration. Such a student duly observes that certain types of literature, certain arts of expression and phases of thought, appear, disappear and reappear at different times and in different countries, down all the course of history. And he further observes that there is always some one age when each literary phenomenon seems to stand out most clearly and completely, whereas at other periods its development and characteristics are either defective or obscure. So he stops at the favourable moment, where the material seems richest or most accessible, and constructs therefrom his theory of the conditions affecting his *genre*, and then he tests his conclusions by comparison with the other *milieus* in which the same type appeared. By watching a form of literature arise, flourish and decay in different ages and among different nations, he distinguishes between its essential qualities and the mannerisms which it affects at each epoch, and he

comes to see what spiritual and social atmospheres are necessary to its growth. After investigating one *genre*, he goes on to the next and then the next, until he has completed the study of every type which lends itself to this treatment.

Thus, in a certain sense, comparative literature is not a history but an aggregate of independent enquiries, each covering its own set of periods, though all contribute knowledge with regard to the place of literature in civilisation. Nevertheless these investigations almost naturally fit into a chronological sequence, and carry the student along the course of time, while he stops at the formation of each set of deductions, to digress into the past or the future in search of corroborative evidence. He begins with the types which can best be studied in the classical world, and he finds that his researches centre in Rome, because we still know too little about the origin and aims of Greek literature and inherit too fragmentary a residue of their output, to use their achievements except for comparison. But oratory, the 'self-conscious' epic, erotic poetry and satire can be studied in Roman literature better than elsewhere. In every case we first consider the ideas, sentiments, society and politics of the time which made these *genres* possible; then the genius and training of their chief exponents; then the Greek models which they copied; then their own artistic ideals and the characteristics of their work. After thus forming an idea of how these types came into existence, in what *milieu* they thrive and of what quality of excellence each is capable, we test our deductions by comparison with the same types at other periods. In oratory we have Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon under Louis XIV, and Burke, Sheridan, Macaulay and others in the Georgian and early Victorian eras. With Virgil we compare Milton, to see what the epos was like in later ages, and a host of poets, including Lucan, Statius, Tasso, Voltaire, Hugo, Tennyson and Morris, to see when and why the epic spirit dies. Our ideas of erotic poetry are enlarged and corrected by comparison with the Italians of the late Middle Ages, the English of the Renascence, the Germans of the *Sturm und Drang* period and the French of the nineteenth century. In satire we have Boileau, Dryden, Pope, Johnson, Crabbe, Rabener and Liscow. But no conception of formal satire would be complete unless we compared it with informal satire, and by briefly reviewing many famous diatribes, pasquinades and parodies (such as *Satyricon, Epistulae Obscurorum Virorum, Simplicius Simplicissimus, Hudibras, Les Châtiments*) showed how different was the atmosphere and scope of the two types, and how both were absorbed in the nineteenth

century novel. The study of these four *genres* will incidentally have given the student some idea of the distinctive classical spirit, and with this knowledge he will be able to approach the Middle Ages and investigate mysticism, romance and the art of story telling. As before, he compares. The first thing which strikes him is the difference between the spirit of medieval and classical Latin; the contrast in idiom and structure, in philosophy, in the legends which gathered round Aristotle, Cicero and especially Virgil, the transition from lyrical to sacred poetry and the transition from Plautine to goliardic humour. Then he compares the vision literature of ancient and medieval times; then the growth of the idea of the Devil, comparing this medieval superstition on the one hand with classical conceptions of evil spirits, and on the other hand continuing the study to Marlowe, Milton and Goethe. Then he compares romances such as *Roman de Troie, Roman de Thèbes, Roman de Jules César* and Chrestien de Troye's imitations of Ovid, with the classical sources to which they are distantly akin, and after that he examines the romantic spirit in the native epics such as the *Chanson de Roland, Nibelungenlied* and the Arthurian cycle. These epics, like the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* are too obscure in their origin and composition to supply data for the study of literary production, but they will be used to complete our conception of romance and of medieval civilisation. We shall now have formed some idea of the conditions, social, domestic, educational and religious, which made story telling one of the chief literary features of this era. The student next proceeds to study the medieval fable and allegory which culminated in *Roman de la Rose* and in *Renard,* emphasising their qualities by comparison on the one hand with Æsop, Phædrus and Avianus, and on the other hand with modern allegories and symbolism. He ends by studying the tale. He forms his first conceptions of the narrative gift from Herodotus, Euripides and Ovid. Then he sees how the *genre* developed in the *exempla,* the *fabliaux,* Boccaccio and Chaucer; then he tests his impressions by comparison with the Renascence *facetiae* and novelettes, and ends by establishing the essential difference between this old fashioned art and the modern short story. Just as a knowledge of the ancient world is necessary to understand the Middle Ages, so an idea of both these cultures is needed if a student is to appreciate the complex conflict of tendencies out of which the Renascence sprang. In this period we can most conveniently consider Hellenism, centring our researches round the sixteenth century Grecians, but always comparing their activity with the civilisation of Periclean Athens, the aims of the

German 'Aufklärung' and the later movements represented by such poets as Heine, Chénier and Shelley. After thus studying the scope and character of humanism, the enquirer passes on to the other three distinctive features of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: the idea of a gentleman, the essay and the drama, about which as much has been said as the narrow limits of this article permit. Most of the literary types which flourished in the eighteenth century can be more successfully studied at other periods; this age, however, brings out most fully the environment and art of letter-writing. The student establishes the difference between natural and artificial epistolography by comparing Cicero and Pliny with Seneca and Cassiodorus. He next enquires why the artificial form recurs so frequently through the Middle Ages up to the mid-seventeenth century and why the true epistolary art is found so seldom. Then he investigates the difference in circumstances, ideas and *milieu* which made the eighteenth century the great age of letter writers. By a comparative examination of such men as Gellert, Voltaire, Goethe, Schiller, Walpole, Gray and Cowper he discovers the secret of their art. On leaving the eighteenth century, it is observed that the drama, the epic, the epistle and formal satire decay, and so by reviewing the conditions which in previous ages had been favourable to these types, the student begins to understand the negative side of the nineteenth century. When he turns to the positive side of this era of change, he finds that the chief features to be investigated are sentimentalism, the feeling for nature, the romantic spirit, and among the more definite achievements, the novel and literary criticism. All that has been learnt of previous centuries contributes towards an understanding of these movements. Sentimentalism, it is true, does not go much further back than the Elizabethan broadsides, but a knowledge of the more academic and scholarly literature of other times enables the reader to understand why this atmosphere began to pervade such novels as *Clarissa* and such dramas as *Kabale und Liebe*. Landscapes are described in Homer, the Greek tragedians, all Roman poets beginning with Catullus; there are allusions to nature throughout the Middle Ages and many formal descriptions of the country in the Renascence and the Augustan age. Criticism became a science in the hands of Aristotle and was zealously practised by Italy in the sixteenth, by France in the seventeenth and by England and Germany in the eighteenth centuries. But the nineteenth century saw both lines of thought develop amazingly in a new direction, and the significance of such men as Rousseau, Walpole, Ugo Foscolo and Sainte-Beuve cannot

be fully appreciated without such a system of comparison. In the same way the study of the novel and of romanticism must begin by a review of the classical spirit down to its ultimate development in the eighteenth century. Having thus grasped what the reaction of this age really means, the student is enabled with more penetration to examine the immediate influences which bore upon nineteenth century literature, and the artistic or social ideals at which its writers aimed. As at other times, he distinguishes what is essential from what is accidental, and what is national from what is universal, by comparing the development of the chief *genres*, such as the lyric or the novel, in different countries and by enquiring why some countries, as England, were so far in advance of others, as Italy.

This scheme of study must necessarily be incomplete and incorrect. In making such an experiment the actual operator has to feel his way; no onlooker or projector can entirely forecast its line of development, and the narrow limits of a periodical publication compel one merely to hint at ideas which need a full explanation. At the same time, enough should have been said to give some glimpses of the field of speculation opened up by the comparative method. In the first place attention would be drawn to many important 'side lights' of literature which do not at present adequately fit in with any specialised course. Not only would such books as *Libri VIII Miraculorum, Eckius Dedolatus, Le Moyen de Parvenir, The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft*, and *Le journal des frères Goncourt*, be discussed on their own merits, but the enquirer would have to reckon with all that moulds the thoughts of men and modifies their ways of expression. Political and social changes—wars, alliances, the rise and fall of classes and religions—or the great contagious outbursts which from time to time have passed over Europe, have often been discussed, but we have still to seek for a point of view which embraces the more commonplace and accidental developments, such as the improvement of houses, the cultivation of gardens, the fluctuations of the labour market and the invention of railways, not to mention matters of direct literary interest, such as the establishment of printing presses, the sale of books, the art of the theatre, censorship, patronage, travelling scholars, and all the hundred ambiguous and tortuous ways by which two writers, separated by space and time, may yet hold communion of thought and expression without one understanding a word of the other's language. And lastly, these general considerations would not blind the enquirer to the more academic questions of style and form. There is a subtle magic in the

arts of expression, and our student must note how and when one writer copies another out of sheer love for the literary type,—yes, and often centres his imitation on some whimsical peculiarity, till the true characteristics of his model are lost sight of. It may be objected that the proposed scheme is far too wide for a limited human intelligence; but it is surprising how much one man may accomplish if he makes proper use of his authorities and takes regular exercise.

A survey of the most suggestive workers in comparative literature, even though necessarily incomplete, will perhaps make clearer the intentions of the present writer. Some of the best known productions are really no more than accumulations of stores, from which each specialist may pick valuable material. In this category fall *Types of English Literature* and *Periods of European Literature*. The former series records how certain *genres* have originated and flourished in a single country, and the latter shows how certain habits of thought and of expression have prevailed at a single epoch. Such compilations cannot be missing from the library of any literary scholar, but, we repeat, they are records, they are books of reference. Professor Neilson's series cannot give us general truths, because each volume is confined to a single nation, nor can Professor Saintsbury's, because the volumes are confined each to a single age. The danger of constructing generalisations out of insufficient material are well illustrated in Taine's *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*. That book is one of the first attempts at a philosophy of literature, but so erratic and protean are the growth and development of books, that the learned Frenchman was led into numberless inconsistencies as soon as he began to establish a world-wide theory out of the evidence gathered from one literature. Professor H. M. Posnett in his *Comparative Literature* avoided such pitfalls by drawing on all literatures eastern and western, but in his endeavour to prove that they were susceptible of scientific treatment he hardly did more than demonstrate that literature is not independent of environment, just as M. Loliée in his *Histoire des Littératures Comparées* has confined himself to showing that civilisation, in some respects, is international. Neither thesis now-a-days needs demonstration. To turn to more specialised workers, we find that the chief exponents of the comparative method fall into two classes. On the one hand there are such men as Comparetti, Reinhartstöttner, Zielinski, Süss, Stempflinger, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Krumbacher, Norden and other contributors to Dr Hinneberg's *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, some of the essayists in *English Literature and the Classics* recently collected by

Mr G. S. Gordon, and in a wider, more constructive field, Mr H. O. Taylor. These scholars show how posterity has clung to the memory or teaching of the great classics, disguising them in the garb of its own civilisation rather than forget them. Thus, while one generation after another is called up to give its estimate of a classic, it is really disclosing the thoughts peculiar to its own age, and through this series of confessions we gain some insight, by means of comparison, into the history of the human mind. And yet these records of the influence of Virgil or Cicero or Plautus or Boetius, are too specialised or too purely historical to give more than fleeting glimpses at the other broader questions which they involve. The mysteries of literary transmission, adaptation and antipathy are touched on only as side-lights, and these valuable monographs are not so much contributions to the philosophy of literature as studies in the posthumous biography of the immortals. However, this school of writers is indispensable to the student of comparative literature, because it shows how a master-mind projects the shadow of his thoughts or of his own personality down through posterity and thus gives some insight into the continuity of literature. The other class, including scholars of such varied attainments as Sir Sidney Lee, M. Charlanne, M. Huszár and M. Bastide, show how a creative author absorbs from other sources much of the material which he is popularly supposed to invent. Such research throws valuable light on the whole question of literary invention and originality and, in some cases, such as in Professor Herford's long established *Literary Relations*, we gain some insight into a people's psychology. And yet all this work cannot be regarded as more than materials for the study of comparative literature. These scholars provide us with remarkable instances of the dependency of writers, but their province is still that of the literary specialist who confines himself to the task of estimating and classifying certain authors or groups of authors.

Few authorities have shown themselves better qualified than Brandes in his *Main Currents* to write philosophically on comparative literature. As he shows how permanent influences, such as national character and geographical conditions, combined with temporary reactions in society and politics, to produce, at a certain period, new forms of thought, we get some glimpses of the forces which govern the creation of books. As he shows how different nations, at different moments, contributed their currents to the flood which was covering Europe, we gain some insight, by comparison, into the value and significance of these forces. But

Main Currents has neither the aims nor the method of comparative literature. Brandes is not attempting an 'anatomy' of literature, but only the appreciation of a 'movement.' His contributions towards a knowledge of how thought takes the forms of artistic expression are incidental.

As might be expected, the comparative method has found its most whole-hearted advocates among writers and lecturers who address themselves to a more general public. Foremost among these stands Brunetière. The auther of *L'Évolution des Genres* never carried out his scheme, but, as far as can be judged from the fragments which he has left, his purpose was to centre his studies on France, which has produced the most logical, complete and formal body of literature in the world. Thus his deductions would have been incomplete. He misses all that is to be learnt from the eccentricities and failures of the English, the Germans and the Italians. He did not attempt to gather together all the instances where literature has conspicuously succeeded or conspicuously failed to express the human mind and out of such data to create a philosophy. He aimed rather at showing through what causes certain types of expression have arisen, reached perfection and decayed in a certain literature—a more difficult and questionable task—and out of such material to form a science. He seems to have intended his work to have been a record rather than an explanation. Professor Vaughan, in *Types of Tragic Drama,* has shown how one national theatre can be used to throw into relief the characteristics of another and Mr W. H. Hudson in his suggestive *An Introduction to the Study of Literature* discusses avowedly 'the comparative method.' Mr Hudson is fully alive to all that can be learnt by tracing the influence of one race or age on another, and by watching how any one of the great literary motives (e.g. the love of man and woman) is passed on from civilisation to civilisation. But, as he is writing for the general public, he contents himself with showing how these studies stimulate that sense of interest and curiosity which we have now accustomed ourselves to name culture. Professor Moulton's otherwise admirable *World Literature* suffers from the same limitations. Though he treats his subject as an organic whole, and has judiciously collected and compared some of its greatest masterpieces, he clearly aims at teaching little more than catholicity of taste; his suggestive book is no new departure in advanced education, but is merely a short cut to what most men of culture accomplish for themselves. Strange as it may sound, the comparative method has been applied in the most philosophic spirit by writers whose intentions are not literary.

Taine's *Philosophie d'Art* (as opposed to his *Histoire de la Littérature*) and H. S. Chamberlain's *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* will at once occur to the reader; so will Troels-Lund's *Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung* and *Gesundheit und Krankheit in der Anschauung alter Zeiten* (German translation), which show how man's conception of the stars, attitude to the Devil, belief in God and ideas of health and sickness vary with every stage of civilisation and furnish the key to each of the past ages. Even more noteworthy examples can be found in the new movement towards psycho-analysis which is being expounded, under Dr Freud's editorship, in the *Schriften zur angewandten Seelenkunde*. Whatever votaries of Belles-Lettres or the 'genus irritabile' may think of the intrusion of these pathologists 'where angels fear to tread,' their contribution to the understanding of literature is considerable. In their endeavour to analyse the fundamental instincts of humanity, they turn to the folk poetry, epic and drama of all countries and ages for illustrations, and show how primitive tendencies, often distorted and perverted by civilisation, inspire and find symbolical expression in some of the greatest themes of literature. The criticism of the future will probably give full consideration to such questions, but, in the meantime, these scientists look at so complex a thing as art from only one point of view, and so see less than half of it.

H. V. Routh.

London.

LA PREMIÈRE HISTOIRE INDIENNE DE CHATEAUBRIAND ET SA SOURCE AMÉRICAINE.

CHATEAUBRIAND, enfin libéré, par la publication de l'*Essai sur les Révolutions* en février ou mars 1797, des engagements qui le liaient à l'éditeur Deboffe, n'est guère tenté de prolonger cette étude comparée des grands mouvements politiques de l'histoire, et d'ajouter un volume à celui qui est sorti—non sans peine—des presses de Baylis. Déjà, vers la fin de son livre, ses impressions d'Amérique et ses souvenirs de voyage, oblitérés jusque-là par des curiosités et des inquiétudes plus pressantes, émergent de plus en plus et s'accommodent tant bien que mal des notes ou des parenthèses que l'*Essai* leur attribue. L'endolorissement sentimental que garde l'émigré, après son aventure de Beccles, la reprise de sauvagerie qui le promène dans les banlieues londoniennes, sans doute aussi la conversation du pasteur Ives, le père de Charlotte, et les livres qu'il a trouvés chez lui, ont redonné l'essor à mille réminiscences de la 'vie sauvage' ou de la 'forêt vierge': il les a mises en forme, pour la première fois, dans des passages tels que la rencontre de Philippe Le Coq ou la fameuse *Nuit chez les Sauvages de l'Amérique*[1].

L'arrivée de Fontanes, au début de 1798, semble le pousser à une réalisation plus marquée de cette littérature encore indistincte. Ce pratique conseiller est peu disposé à laisser son ami éparpiller sa rêverie: il faut, à son gré, que les nébuleuses se fixent en étoiles. Et si les milieux 'monarchiens' où Chateaubriand vient, sur ces entrefaites, de trouver accès[2] rattachaient le solitaire à une société qui ne l'effarouchait pas trop, l'intervention de Fontanes paraît bien avoir eu pour effet, dès ce moment, de cristalliser quelque peu, pour la publication, l'exotisme littéraire qui se trouvait comme diffus dans les conversations et les travaux de son compagnon. Lucile disait jadis à son frère, à Combourg, lorsqu'il lui communiquait les mouvements de son inquiète

[1] *Essai*, Seconde Partie, chap. LVI et LVII.

[2] Cf. F. Baldensperger, *Chateaubriand et l'Émigration royaliste à Londres* dans *Études d'histoire littéraire*, 2e série.

imagination: 'Tu devrais peindre tout cela.' L'ami prudent que Fructidor avait envoyé au jeune écrivain lui aura dit sans doute, en lui entendant lire ses fragments américains: 'Vous devriez publier ceci....'

C'est du moins ainsi qu'apparaît le rôle de Fontanes, à propos de quelques pages assez peu connues où se pose un des premiers problèmes relatifs à Chateaubriand et à son exotisme littéraire. Et puisque le grand écrivain déclarait lui-même qu'il avait ramené d'Amérique une 'nouvelle Muse,' il n'est pas sans intérêt de rattacher à l'œuvre d'une romancière des États-Unis une petite publication qui s'apparente aux travaux préparatoires de ces futurs récits exotiques, les *Natchez* et le *Voyage en Amérique.*

* * * * * *

Chateaubriand avait-il eu l'occasion, tandis qu'à Philadelphie et New-York il dépouillait quelques-unes de ses illusions sur le caractère 'antique' de la jeune République américaine, de lire une œuvre récemment parue, et propre en revanche à flatter une autre chimère, la foi dans les vertus primordiales de la vie sauvage? En bon disciple de Rousseau qui va confronter la doctrine du maître avec quelques réalités, et que l'inquiétude sociale des temps a rendu doublement sensible aux mérites de l'humanité primitive, le chevalier de Combourg aurait trouvé fort à son goût l'idée maîtresse d'*Ouabi, ou les vertus de la Nature*[1], sorte d'épopée lyrique en quatre chants due à la plume de Mrs Morton sous le pseudonyme de PHILENIA, A LADY OF BOSTON. Il y aurait vu, fondée sur des détails authentiques et une information 'indienne' garantie par des notes fréquentes au bas des pages, appuyée sur l'autorité inattendue de Sébastien Mercier[2], une histoire bien faite pour plaire au René qui sommeillait et pour intéresser sa sensibilité d'explorateur, de voyageur et d'intellectuel aventureux.

Chez les Illinois, 'où le Mississipi roule ses flots paternels[3], les chefs tatoués du désert explorent les bois, les sachems féroces soulèvent le fracas

[1] *Ouabi, or the Virtues of Nature, an Indian tale*, Boston, 1790, dedié à James Bowdoin, gouverneur de la république de Massachusetts. Sur la place de cette œuvre dans l'histoire de la fiction romanesque, cf. L. Deming Loshe, *The Early American Novel*, thèse de Columbia University, New York, 1907, p. 67. Sur l'auteur, Mrs Sarah Wentworth Morton, cf. *Magazine of American History*, 1883, tome x, p. 420. Le critique reproduit et apprécie, avec ironie, le jugement de la *Monthly Review* (Sept. 1793) sur la déclamatoire et insipide poésie de Mrs Morton: le trop galant rédacteur portait aux nues la Muse américaine et, dans le même numéro, exécutait brièvement Wordsworth!

[2] Cf. Préface, VII, Mrs Morton a puisé son information dans les lettres de William Penn à ses amis anglais.

[3] Note de Mrs Morton: 'Mississipi, an Indian name, signifying the great father of rivers,' p. 10. Cf. 'Where Mississipi rolls his parent flood, The desert's painted chiefs explore the wood, etc.'

des batailles....' Ouabi, jeune chef illinois, a pour femme la tendre Azakia. 'Ses pieds délicats s'ornaient de sandales brillantes; des perles scintillantes irradiaient ses cheveux tressés; une ceinture pudique enserrait sa taille souple...[1].' Celario, un Européen exilé, promène sa rêverie désespérée sur les bords du Missîssipi. Soudain il entend un cri perçant dans la forêt et, suivant la direction du son, il découvre Azakia embrassant les genoux d'un Huron menaçant. Il abat l'ennemi, délivre la belle captive, se sent gagné par tant d'innocence et de charme, et confesse aussitôt son amour. Mais, comme le note Mrs Morton, 'les femmes indiennes d'Amérique sont très chastes après le mariage, et si quelqu'un leur fait une déclaration, elles répondent: l'ami qui est devant mes yeux m'empêche de te voir[2].' Entre eux deux, dit Azakia, s'élève ainsi, 'plus brillante que l'étoile du matin,' l'image d'Ouabi 'renommé à la guerre.' Et elle entraîne son sauveur vers le camp. Ouabi, le sachem 'formé par la main divine de la nature et dont les membres nus défient l'art du sculpteur[3],' accueille Celario comme un frère. Il lui offre le secours de son bras et l'asile de sa hutte. En revanche, l'Européen 'fuyant le vice perfide, lui consacre sa vie[4].' Celario combat avec Ouabi contre les Hurons. Un jour il est blessé dans une bataille et soigné par Azakia[5]. Elle applique des simples sur ses blessures et prépare ses repas. Le convalescent s'émeut de cette sollicitude. Avec ses forces reviennent ses désirs. En l'absence d'Ouabi, il renouvelle ses tentatives et se heurte à un nouveau refus. 'Aussi longtemps que les épis que le guerrier rompit avec elle, droits comme l'honneur, brillants comme la gloire, n'ont pas subi la flamme dévorante[6],' Azakia restera fidèle à son époux. Celario, humilié par cette primitive et forte vertu, décide de fuir la tentation et de quitter son silvestre refuge. Mais voici qu'Ouabi, revenant de ses expéditions et ignorant ses scrupules, le force à rester. Il repart à la guerre en lui confiant la garde de sa femme. Alors Azakia, prise d'amour, se donne héroïquement une rivale. Pour protéger sa foi vacillante, elle veut mettre une barrière entre elle et Celario et facilite—sans succès—les entrevues de l'exilé et de Zisma, la belle et jeune sauvage[7]. Cependant Ouabi est tombé, blessé, aux mains

[1] *Ib.* p. 11:

'With splendid beads her braided tresses shone,
Her bending waist a modest girdle bound.'

[2] p. 13:

'The friend that is before my eyes prevents my seeing you.'

[3] p. 14.

[4] p. 15:

'From perfidious vice I flee, And devote my life to thee.'

[5] (Chant I.)

[6] *Ib.* p. 24.

[7] (Chant II.)

des Hurons. Et Mrs Morton le remarque en note : ' un usage superstitieux et immémorial parmi les Indiens veut que si, dans les quarante jours après la mort de son mari, sa veuve le voit et lui parle dans deux songes, elle en déduise qu'il l'appelle au séjour des âmes—et rien ne peut l'empêcher de se donner la mort[1].' Or Azakia a vu l'apparition d'Ouabi : ' la nuit dernière vint le radieux guerrier, tendant vers moi ses bras héroïques[2].' Celario cherche à la détourner de son fatal dessein, à écarter le breuvage mortel. La seule chose qu'il obtienne, c'est qu'elle promet ' par toutes les puissances brillantes des cieux ' de ne pas toucher à sa vie avant d'avoir la certitude de la mort d'Ouabi. Et il s'en va avec les fidèles Illinois à la recherche du sachem. Rencontre avec les Hurons et victoire. Ils trouvent Ouabi sur le bûcher, entonnant le ' Chant de mort.' Ils le délivrent, le ramènent, et le chef défaillant abandonne à Celario, avec une perspicacité magnanime, celle qu'il a sauvée deux fois. Quant à lui—ultime et brève compensation—il épouse avant de mourir la modeste et silencieuse Zisma.

* * * * * *

Chateaubriand aurait-il rapporté, parmi les notes désordonnées qui constituèrent son premier dossier américain, une analyse d'*Ouabi* ? Cette démonstration des ' vertus de la Nature ' voisinait-elle, dans son bagage de voyageur, avec ses documents botaniques et zoologiques ? Et, si des manuscrits occupaient, à l'armée des Princes, la plus grande place dans son havre-sac d'émigré, peut-on croire qu'Azakia autant qu'Atala se glissait, dès 92, parmi d'inutiles cartouches[3] ? Ou bien est-ce en Angleterre seulement, au moment de ses grandes débauches de lecture, que notre chevalier fit connaissance de ces ' enfants des solitudes ' ? Les pasteurs de Beccles et de Bungay avaient l'un et l'autre des livres ; l'œuvre de Mrs Morton était de celles qu'une jeune Anglaise de l'âge de Charlotte pouvait lire sans scrupule, tant les incolores pentamètres de l'écrivain américain émoussaient la pointe de cette aventure de passion ' au fond des déserts.' D'autre part, à son retour à Londres, Chateaubriand n'a pas cessé d'être muni de livres : parmi les bibliothèques où il pouvait avoir accès, il faut citer celle d'un riche membre de l'Académie royale, John Symmons, dont un émigré, Gauthier de Brécy, était devenu bibliothécaire pour le plus grand avantage de ses compagnons d'exil, Delille entre autres, le charitable Anglais ayant mis à leur disposition ses 40000 volumes et en particulier

[1] p. 32 (Chant III).
[2] (Chant IV.)
[3] *Mém. d'outre-tombe*, éd. Biré, tome II, p. 58.

les 7 ou 8000 ouvrages français qui s'y trouvaient[1]. Chateaubriand, en tout cas, pouvait retrouver en Angleterre, aussi bien que les récits de voyageurs et de missionnaires qui alimentaient son information d'explorateur, cette histoire d'outre-mer.

Elle s'apparentait à merveille, en tout cas, à ses dispositions de 1797 ou 98, à l'heure où la nature, en lui, ne cédait pas sans soubresauts à la société, et où le souvenir de Charlotte lui faisait porter si douloureusement son cœur en écharpe. Ses longues randonnées vers Hampstead Heath et jusqu'à Harrow, ses rêveries en face des molles campagnes que traverse la Tamise, ce n'étaient plus, assurément, les vertus de la nature telles qu'il les avait encore célébrées à la fin de l'*Essai*: cependant on peut jouer au sauvage, au civilisé qui se libère, dans les districts les plus peuplés d'un pays habité, dès qu'on porte au fond du cœur assez de farouche individualisme; et le fantôme de Charlotte peuplait les prairies et les bruyères de ces banlieues au point de rendre partout présente une Azakia délicieusement secourable et tendre.

Aussi peut-on légitimement attribuer aux mois les plus mélancoliques de 1797 l'élaboration d'un 'conte' qui sera l'un des premiers échantillons soumis à Fontanes, en février 1798, par le jeune confrère retrouvé à Londres. Mieux que les ambitieux *Natchez* que le prestige du *Paradis perdu* sollicite vers la forme magnifique de l'épopée chrétienne en prose, un récit indien d'une vingtaine de pages paraîtra, au sage conseiller de Chateaubriand, digne d'être publié, comme un essai et une amorce. Et c'est ainsi, sans doute, qu'*Azakia et Celario* va se retrouver dans des périodiques pour lesquels Fontanes était parfaitement en mesure de servir d'intermédiaire et d'introducteur.

La *Bibliothèque britannique* de Genève, d'abord. Ce 'recueil extrait des ouvrages périodiques et autres' avait commencé, en 1796, à fournir à ses lecteurs une matière principalement anglaise, mais où l'Amérique, elle aussi, avait sa place[2]. Fontanes, dont on sait les relations de famille avec Genève[3], a été en correspondance avec quelques-uns des hommes qui dirigeaient cette publication, Marc-Auguste Pictet, Pierre Picot, Pierre Prévost, pasteurs ou professeurs érudits ou lettrés. Correspondances

[1] Cf. Gauthier de Brécy, *Révolution de Toulon en* 1793, manuscrit rédigé en 1795, laïssé à Londres en 1802, et publié en 1814, p. 95 de l'édition de 1828; Regnault de Beaucaron, *Souvenirs anecdotiques et historiques d'anciennes familles champenoises et bourguignonnes*. Paris, 1906, p. 241.

[2] Le tome v (1797) publie une copieuse analyse du livre de Bartram sur les coutumes des Creeks. Cf. aussi Février 1797 (*Découverte à l'ouest du Canada*), Mars 1797 (*Excursions sur les Montagnes bleues*).

[3] Son parent, Jean Fontanes, avait été pasteur de l'église française de Hambourg; il était rentré à Genève en 1755 pour y occuper une chaire de belles-lettres.

relatives surtout[1] à des années postérieures à celle qui nous arrête ici, mais qui continuent des rapports personnels noués dès 1787, et maintenus par le passage de Fontanes à Genève à plusieurs reprises: c'est ainsi qu'après sa fameuse évasion de Lyon, le rédacteur très 'juste milieu' du *Modérateur* avait fait une rapide escale dans la cité du Léman.

Telles sont les raisons—toutes conjecturales assurément—qui peuvent expliquer la publication, dans le numéro de mai 1798 de la *Bibliothèque britannique* de Genève[2], d'une 'variété' intitulée *Azakia et Celario, conte.* Nulle indication ne signalait la dépendance qui rattachait ce récit au livre de Mrs Morton: de fait, l'auteur anonyme procède fort librement à l'égard de ce premier canevas. Et si, comme tout le fait supposer, c'est bien le futur auteur de *René* qui s'exerce ici, par des 'gammes' encore hésitantes, à la virtuosité et au grand art, si c'est donc, entre l'*Essai sur les Révolutions* et les premières amorces du *Génie*, une des rares pages publiées par l'écrivain, il est intéressant de surprendre, dans son effort d'affranchissement et d'indépendance, un auteur qui a besoin, lui aussi, d'un 'premier mot,' mais qui rétrécit, étire et transforme son canevas selon ses propres dispositions.

* * * * * *

Non loin des lieux où le Missouri vient mêler ses eaux bourbeuses aux ondes limpides du Mississipi, on voit une peuplade également intéressante par son origine et par ses mœurs.... Elle fut formée par les hardis enfants de la France qui pénétrèrent jadis dans ces régions reculées, et fondèrent leurs établissements au cœur de l'Amérique.... Ces colons ont l'activité des hordes qui font de la chasse leur occupation chérie: ils ont les inclinations paisibles des peuples agricoles, la simplicité des peuples pasteurs. Un petit nombre de lois suffit au maintien de l'ordre chez des hommes que les mœurs gouvernent, et qui n'ont rien à s'envier. Les Français du Mississipi ne connaissent la vie sauvage que par ses douceurs, la civilisation que par ses bienfaits....

Cette entrée en matière, en faisant d'une colonie française en terre américaine le point de départ de l'histoire, établit à sa façon—qui est celle de *René* et du *Génie*—un lien entre les aventures qui vont se dérouler et les vastes entreprises nationales. Celario 'a vu le jour dans un de ces établissements favorisés de la nature.' Mais l'influence du milieu n'a guère agi sur cette âme inquiète: tandis que l'original de Mrs Morton s'intéresse peu au caractère de Celario et préfère l'idyllique description

[1] Communications de MM. Aubert, sous-conservateur des manuscrits à la Bibliothèque de Genève, et Frédéric Rilliet, descendant de A. Pictet.

[2] Tome VIII, p. 95. Ce ne serait pas le seul exemple d'un périodique suisse publiant à ce moment de la 'copie' dû à un émigré français résidant en Angleterre. C'est ainsi que le *Journal littéraire de Lausanne*, auquel collaborent Joseph de Maistre et le marquis de Surville, donne en 1798 des fragments de la *Promenade autour de la Grande-Bretagne* de l'émigré La Tocnaye.

à l'élémentaire analyse, toute une psychologie impatiente et trouble s'esquisse ici.

Il entre dans son cinquième lustre[1].... Doué des qualités qui accompagnent le courage, il est loyal, fier, généreux ; mais il a les défauts des âmes ardentes et de la jeunesse inexpérimentée. L'habitude de vaincre lui donne le besoin de dominer. Il est impatient de tous les jougs ; il souffre à peine des égaux. La contradiction l'enflamme. Sa colère est redoutée : il le sent, et il en devient plus ardent, plus impétueux.

Ce byronisme avant la lettre fait à bon droit présager des aventures peu communes : un duel où Celario tue son adversaire l'oblige à quitter la colonie ; il passe le fleuve dans un canot abandonné et va tenter la fortune sur l'autre rive. Il est au courant des ressources des tribus sauvages et se sent attiré vers celles qui ont acquis le plus de célebrité par les armes, Illinois et Hurons.

Le hasard l'avait conduit au déclin du jour sur les bords d'une forêt sombre. Tout à coup des cris perçants viennent frapper son oreille. Il accourt. Il voit un sauvage[2] le bras levé sur une femme suppliante. Il s'élance ; et avec la rapidité de l'éclair, il frappe le barbare qui tombe sans vie. Il rassure alors celle qu'il a sauvée ; il la contemple ; il l'admire. Il éprouve un sentiment nouveau. Un trouble secret a penétré dans son cœur. Il tremble devant une femme.

Mais il ne lui fait pas, comme dans l'*Ouabi* de Mrs Morton, une déclaration d'amour intempestive. Il y a plus de délicatesse dans le cœur de René. Azakia mène son sauveur à Ouabi son époux, le grand chef illinois, qui l'adopte comme un fils : car c'est un noble vieillard—et non plus un jeune homme—à qui le mariage indien a attribué pour femme la dolente Azakia. Voici en quel lieu se fait la présentation et se donne l'investiture illinoise du jeune étranger :

Parmi les détours obscurs d'une antique forêt que les rayons de l'astre de la nuit ne pénètrent qu'à peine ; entre des bancs de rochers entourés de broussailles épaisses, est une vaste et profonde caverne, dont l'entrée n'est connue que des seuls Illinois. Là, les guerriers réunis après le combat qui les a dispersés, comptent et déplorent leurs pertes. Leur chef Ouabi, assis sur un bloc de marbre, au centre d'une aire spacieuse, les exhorte à la vengeance. Il invoque le grand esprit.... Comme on voit un vieux chêne encore verdoyant, respecté par la hache et les années, dominer les rejetons vigoureux d'une forêt, et élever sa tête vénérable parmi les enfants de la même terre, tel paraît le chef des guerriers, au milieu des compagnons de ses travaux.

Celario reçoit, de ce sachem vénérable, le droit de cité sauvage. ('Tu apprendras, à notre exemple, à ruser comme le renard, à attaquer, à combattre comme le tigre, à fuir comme l'orignal.... Tu enlèveras la chevelure des morts ; et tu boiras dans le crâne d'un ennemi....') Surprise, combat, ralliement des Hurons, dont les nouveaux amis de

[1] Chateaubriand a vingt-trois ans quand il entreprend son expédition américaine.
[2] Ici, comme dans l'original, un Huron qui fait violence à la femme d'un chef illinois.

Celario ont cependant raison, grâce à sa vaillance et à son élan. Mais il est blessé, et Azakia s'installe, pour le soigner, au chevet de sa couche primitive. 'Elle charme ses douleurs par sa présence et par ses discours. Elle panse elle-même sa blessure. Elle lui prépare ses aliments. Elle boit la première dans la coupe qu'elle lui présente. Elle veille à ses côtés lorsqu'il repose ; elle rencontre ses regards à son réveil.'

Il va de soi que Celario s'éprend de sa garde-malade : tout l'y poussait, la fatalité du cœur autant que le précédent offert par Mrs Morton et que l'expérience récente de Chateaubriand, au presbytère où sa chute de cheval l'avait conduit.... Un jour qu'on brûle vifs trois captifs, un père avec ses deux fils, nos deux jeunes gens, trop sensibles pour se repaître d'un aussi horrible spectacle, s'écartent de cette cruelle fête et s'égarent 'sur le penchant d'un vallon.'...

L'air était embaumé par le parfum des arbustes fleuris. Une vapeur à peine sensible couvrait le paysage, en adoucissait l'aspect, et semblait mettre en harmonie toutes les teintes de la nature.

...La pente d'un vert gazon, parsemée de locustes et de mûriers, conduisait l'œil, par une gradation insensible, jusqu'à un large ruisseau qui serpentait dans les prairies, et dont un brouillard léger marquait le cours jusqu'à la rivière des Illinois, qu'on découvrait comme une lame argentée sur un lointain horizon. Au delà du ruisseau, une majestueuse forêt que le soleil commençait à dorer de ses rayons, s'élevait en amphithéâtre. Elle était couronnée par des bancs de rochers, surmontés de sommets arrondis et verdoyants.... Les oiseaux faisaient entendre leurs chants d'amour, et le cri de la cigale, porté par les zéphyrs, se mêlait aux concerts des habitants des bois.

Dans ce 'ravissant' décor, l'âme de Celario s'amollit.

Il regarde Azakia et il soupire. Elle ne lui avait point encore paru si belle. Une guirlande de fleurs et de plumes flottantes couronnaient ses cheveux d'un noir d'ébène qui tombaient en boucles redoublées sur ses épaules et sur son front. Un manteau blanc, d'un tissu léger, agraffé sur son sein, embrassait de ses replis sa taille svelte. Le souple brodequin lui servait de chaussure. Le carquois sonnant était suspendu à ses épaules ; et elle s'appuyait sur son arc. La rose de la santé était sur ses lèvres ; le feu de la jeunesse brillait dans son regard. La démarche, son port gracieux et fier, l'air de majesté répandu sur toute sa personne, rappellent à Celario les attributs et les charmes de la déesse des forêts.

Sans doute il y a encore là des vestiges de la phraséologie descriptive du XVIII^e^ siècle, mais sous ces banalités il y a des choses vues, bien senties, des impressions de nature fraîches et neuves pour l'époque. Ces citations donnent un exemple du style, harmonieux et ample. A côté de comparaisons classiques (le vieillard et le chêne, les morts et les épis fauchés), on trouve çà et là une notation directe et pittoresque.

Nos deux amoureux se font leurs confidences ; Celario apprend à connaître toute la fidélité conjugale des femmes indiennes ('l'ami que j'ai devant les yeux m'empêche de vous voir') et décide de fuir. Il imagine douloureusement les solitudes où le conduira son double exil.

Je quitterai les lieux où tes regards peuvent m'atteindre. J'irai chercher, dans de lointains climats, l'oubli des maux que j'endure.... Mais soit que le destin dirige ma course errante vers les sauvages retraites des Algonkins, où les frimas suspendent le cours des fleuves ; soit que je cherche un refuge sur les bords enchantés du Miami ou de l'Ohio ; soit que je porte mes pas incertains jusque dans les contrées brûlantes des Alibamous et des Natchès, toujours, oh toujours ! tes bontés généreuses seront présentes à mon souvenir.

Est-ce à Charlotte Ives, la chère abandonnée de Bungay, que s'adresse cet adieu désolé ? Il était déjà indiqué, dans le poème de Mrs Morton[1], et Chateaubriand s'en est emparé en le rendant plus pathétique. D'ailleurs l'arrivée d'Ouabi, déterminant le jeune Français à rester parmi les Illinois, modifie le cours des événements. Une nouvelle attaque huronne fait tomber le sachem aux mains de l'ennemi.

Les Hurons et les Iroquois, satisfaits d'un avantage signalé, glorieux surtout de compter parmi leurs captifs un des chefs longtemps célèbres des Illinois, revinrent sur leurs pas, traînant à leur suite les malheureux que le sort des armes leur avait livrés. Mais le nombre de ceux-ci embarrassait et retardait leur marche : ils résolurent de consacrer une nuit aux sacrifices de la vengeance.

Au sein des bois qui couvrent de leur ombre épaisse les bords de la grande rivière des Illinois, on trouve une vallée profonde que creusa pendant des siècles le torrent qui l'arrose. Les cîmes dépouillées, les troncs abattus et blanchis, parmi les fragments de rocher que recouvre la mousse, y accusent la main du temps et l'absence de l'homme. Les hurlements des animaux féroces répétés par les échos et confondus avec le bruit de l'onde, y troublent seuls le silence de la nature. C'est dans ce lieu solitaire et sauvage que les troupes réunies des Hurons et des Iroquois entraînent leurs victimes pour célébrer la fête de mort qui les attend.

Mais Celario paraît avec les Illinois. 'Les guerriers épars et saisis d'épouvante se dissipent à son approche, comme les feuilles que disperse un ouragan furieux.' Il voit Ouabi sur le bûcher au milieu des flammes ; il le délivre, mais trop tard pour l'empêcher de mourir. Et tandis qu'une intrigue secondaire, dans l'original, amenait le jeune sachem à renoncer à Azakia et à épouser *in extremis* la pâle Zisma, le vieil Ouabi, arraché aux mains des Hurons et des Iroquois, se comporte plus noblement encore—et tout aussi avantageusement pour l'avenir sentimental de Celario : il joint les mains d'Azakia et de son amant, et leur donne les conseils de la plus cordiale expérience, sous une forme que les PP. Aubry et Souel n'auraient pas dédaignée.

'Les ardentes passions de la jeunesse peuvent encore vous séduire. Défiez-vous des plaisirs que le devoir condamne, et que la douleur suit de près. N'oubliez jamais ce mot d'un ami qui a vécu sans reproche et qui meurt sans crainte : le secret du bonheur est dans la paix avec soi-même.' Ainsi parle le sage vieillard,

[1] Cf. *Ouabi*, p. 25:

'Soon, ah! soon I must away,
Where Scioto's waters flow,
Or the fiery Chactaws glow,
Or the snowy mountains rise
Frozen by Canadian skies.'

et ce sont ses dernières paroles. Ses forces épuisées l'abandonnent. La flamme de vie qui brillait encore dans son regard s'affaiblit et s'éteint. Ses yeux, fixés sur Azakia, se ferment à la lumière du jour ; et le grand Ouabi, si longtemps la terreur des ennemis de sa nation, n'est plus qu'un cadavre insensible.

Tel est le récit de Chateaubriand. Le jeune auteur qui s'essaie, se fait la main avant d'affronter les *Natchez*, n'y déploie pas encore un grand talent, mais il y fait preuve de bon goût. Il simplifie la prolixe et banale histoire de Mrs Morton, il lui donne une unité, il supprime la première déclaration vraiment trop rapide et à peine convenable, il fait d'Ouabi un vieillard qui laisse pressentir Chactas, et de Celario un fils adoptif aussi individualiste, aussi mélancoliquement insatisfait que René. Il abolit les deux songes d'Azakia et l'épisode de Zisma qui embarrassent la marche du récit ; enfin, au lieu du spécieux et commode échange final, il trouve une solution grave et noble qui fait honneur à la perspicacité d'Ouabi.

En dehors des linéaments essentiels que Chateaubriand modifiait au gré de ses propres états d'âme et que sa documentation américaine—missionnaires et voyageurs—l'incitait à transformer, il trouvait encore dans le récit ou les notes de Mrs Morton plus d'un détail de folk-lore ou de description qu'enregistrait sa mémoire ou sa plume. Sans doute il est difficile de dire ce qu'il retint d'*Ouabi* et ce qu'il puisa dans Charlevoix et Bartram. On trouve au cours de l'épopée lyrique américaine plus d'un motif exotique qui sera repris dans les *Natchez* : 'the warrior feast,' 'the fierce-dance,' 'the peaceful calumet,' 'the death-song[2]' et cette note sur les funérailles : 'the posture in which they bury their dead is either sitting or standing.' Et Chateaubriand lui-même a transformé en 'Natchès' les 'Chactaws' qu'évoque, dans *Ouabi*, l'ami désolé d'Azakia. La disposition du conseil de guerre est identique dans le poème de Mrs Morton, le conte de la *Bibliothèque britannique* et les *Natchez*[1]. Mais le 'Chant de mort' d'*Azakia et Celario* est beaucoup plus élaboré, beaucoup plus vigoureux aussi que le 'death-song' d'*Ouabi*[2]. Il repose sur un triple refrain que rien ne pouvait inspirer dans l'original américain et se développe sur le rhythme fruste que Chateaubriand reprendra plus tard dans le chant de guerre des Francs. Les Hurons, prisonniers d'Ouabi, immobiles sur le bûcher, entonnent leur chant de mort :

'Acharnez-vous, vils ennemis, comme des frelons sur le tigre. J'ai combattu vingt ans contre votre nation. J'ai fait périr de ma main l'élite de vos guerriers. J'ai surpris vos camps. J'ai brûlé vos villages et vos moissons. J'ai répandu parmi vous la consternation et le désespoir. Vengez-vous si vous le pouvez. Déchirez,

[1] *Ouabi*, p. 13 : the warrior-council : they seat themselves in semicircles or half-moons.
[2] *Ib.* p. 37.

consumez ce corps que je vous abandonne. Mon âme est au-dessus de vos atteintes[1]. Acharnez-vous, vils ennemis, comme les frelons sur le tigre....

...Comme une troupe de chiens sans courage se réunit contre l'ours des forêts, ameutez-vous, faibles Illinois, contre un enfant de notre nation. La fermeté de nos femmes ferait honte à vos guerriers. Ils craignent la mort dans les combats : nous la bravons dans les supplices. Approchez-vous sans trembler, car mes mains sont liées. Ameutez-vous, faibles Illinois, contre un enfant de notre nation, comme une troupe de chiens sans courage se réunit contre l'ours des forêts.

D'autres motifs de folklore, développés par Mrs Morton, ne semblent pas avoir dépassé le récit d'*Azakia et Celario* : 'l'ami que j'ai devant les yeux m'empêche de te voir.' Le thème des songes de la veuve et celui des épis sacrés que l'on retrouve dans une autre version d'Azakia ont disparu dans celle de la *Bibliothèque britannique.*

* * * * * *

La fortune d'*Ouabi* ne s'arrête pas en effet, au numéro de mai 1798 de la *Bibliothèque britannique.* En août, la même année[2], le *Spectateur du Nord,* l'importante revue fondée à Hambourg par Baudus, reproduisait intégralement le texte du périodique genevois : ces emprunts, de l'un à l'autre magazine, ne sont pas rares, et, par exemple, une *Histoire de la Roche,* édifiante à souhait, figure parallèlement vers ce même temps dans les deux périodiques. Cependant le *Spectateur* ajoute à son texte cette mention qui manque dans la *Bibliothèque* : 'le fond de ce conte est tiré d'un poème anglais imprimé à Boston, sous le titre *The Virtues of Nature.*' Faut-il croire que l'auteur anonyme de l'adaptation a eu une sorte de repentir et s'est senti obligé de faire l'aveu de sa dépendance lointaine ? Mais, entre lui et la rédaction du *Spectateur,* c'est encore Fontanes qu'on est tenté d'imaginer comme intermédiaire. On sait qu'après quelques mois d'amitié, d'intimité, de promenades et de causeries, de discussions philosophiques (ou anti-philosophiques) et d'entreprises politiques, Fontanes avait quitté Londres : son itinéraire l'arrêta quelque temps à Hambourg où il vit, comme de juste, le libraire Fauche, et fut reçu par les rédacteurs du *Spectateur.* Ceci se passait quelques semaines avant que cette revue de l'Émigration reprît le conte publié trois mois auparavant par la *Bibliothèque.*

Enfin voici que tout à la fin de cette année, le 31 décembre 1798, le périodique dirigé à Londres, sous le titre *Paris pendant l'année...,* par l'ineffable Peltier, ami, bienfaiteur fréquent et coreligionnaire politique intermittent de Chateaubriand, donne à son tour[3] la même aventure,

[1] Cf. la chanson de mort de Chactas : 'Je ne crains pas les tourments, je suis brave, o Muscogulges....' (*Natchez.*)

[2] Tome VII, p. 153.

[3] Tome XX, p. 141.

mais sous une forme dépouillée, grêle et gauche qui est peut-être le résumé primitif conservé par Chateaubriand, peut-être une réfection de Peltier. Cependant le Canada, où l'histoire est nettement située, la qualité militaire du baron de Castainville qui ne devient Celario qu'assez tard, une certaine désinvolture dans les sentiments et le dénouement de l'intrigue[1], une moindre couleur locale aussi, semblent s'accorder pour faire de cet essai un 'état' antérieur du même opuscule. Chateaubriand, cédant aux instances de Peltier qui avait pu donner, un an auparavant, son adaptation de l'*Élégie* de Gray, aura laissé au journaliste la première maquette de ce qui était devenu déjà, dans l'intervalle et pour d'autres, une figurine intéressante. Cette ébauche américaine du futur grand artiste avait été signalée[2]; mais M. Cassagne, qui admet qu'elle soit du Chateaubriand avant la lettre—et avant l'art—a raison de n'y trouver, ni dans la psychologie ni dans le style, rien qui porte la marque 'd'une personnalité extraordinaire[3].'

C'est que, précisément, une amertume, une fièvre nouvelles étaient venues, pour d'autres lecteurs, modifier les traits et les détails de cette histoire empruntée à la littérature américaine encore balbutiante. Chateaubriand traversait sur ces entrefaites sa crise essentielle : l'histoire canadienne de *Paris* est antérieure, en dépit de sa date, à ces mois d'inquiétude accrue qui avaient permis au jeune écrivain d'ajouter du mouvement et du style à ce fait-divers de la forêt vierge dont il gardait (et dont il gardera longtemps) l'obsédant souvenir.

F. Baldensperger.
J. M. Carré.

Paris.

[1] Ouabi cède sa femme à Celario pour épouser lui-même la jeune Zisma ; et comme il ne meurt pas, c'est une simple répartition nouvelle d'affinités électives qui s'est opérée à l'aimable. C'est là la seule modification essentielle apportée à l'histoire originale.

[2] F. Baldensperger, *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1907, p. 606, et *Études d'histoire littéraire*, 2e série.

[3] *La vie politique de François de Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1911, p. 29. Si l'on admet que c'est là un premier travail, un dépouillement provisoire de la fade épopée américaine, on comprend que Chateaubriand écrive ce résumé à la fois concis, prosaïque, et fidèle. Il veut fixer l'affabulation essentielle et le détail exotique : aussi reproduit-il *littéralement* au cours de son récit les notes marginales du poème sur les mœurs indiennes. Il ne laisse échapper aucun des thèmes folkloriques, sans les utiliser d'ailleurs d'une façon *littéraire*.

WIT AND HUMOUR IN DANTE.

Professor Sannia's work on the humorous element in the *Divine Comedy*[1] marks in some respects an epoch in the study of Dante. Its title may seem audacious, to the verge of irreverence; but if this is so, the fault lies partly in an age-long neglect of one aspect of the great poet's nature, partly in a difficulty (common to both the Italian language and our own) confronting the critic who would define in appropriate language that subtle element—now gently playful, now fiercely ironical—which redeems Dante's work as a whole from dulness, and makes the *Divine Comedy* in particular one of the most human books ever written.

Whether or not Professor Sannia has fallen deep into the pit that ensnares most critics who have a hobby and a mission, his pioneer movement is certainly far from futile. We believe that he has largely proved his point, and given us, in consequence, a living Dante in place of the traditional wooden effigy. At any rate his work will have justified itself if it turns the attention of all-too-serious Dante students to a new field, and emphasizes those qualities in the Divine Poet which the sheer sublimity of his work has hitherto tended to obscure.

In the following study we shall not confine ourselves to the limits of the *Divina Commedia*, but gather all we can in so short a space from his other works, and especially from the *Convivio* and the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.

As a preliminary we shall do well to bestow a glance at least upon Dante's environment from this particular point of view—the temper of the generation in which he lived, and that of his immediate circle, not neglecting such inferences as may be suggested by the tradition of his physiognomy and the evidence of his earliest biographers. For a provisional definition of the subject we may turn to 'The Philosopher' from whom Dante and his contemporaries drew directly and indirectly. 'Melancholy men of all others are most witty.' So said the 'Maestro

[1] *Il comico, l' umorismo e la satira nella Divina Commedia.* Da Enrico Sannia. 2 vols. Milan, 1909.

di color che sanno,' according to the author of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*; and Boccaccio[1], describing the habitual expression of Dante's face, says it was 'always melancholy and thoughtful.'

Before we draw the enticing inference that Dante was a paragon of wit, we shall, however, do well to verify our quotation from Aristotle, and to bear in mind the fact that the words 'wit' and 'witty,' like their companions 'humour,' 'humorous,' have changed their meaning since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By 'Wit and Humour,' as applied to Dante, we mean something vague and general, yet sufficiently definite to make our quest practicable. The phrase is intended to cover the playful and fanciful use of the intellect upon literary material, in the broadest sense: from the simplest and most elementary puns and word-plays to the subtlest and most surprising analogies; from the most discursive description of a laughably incongruous situation, to the swift agility of brilliant paradox; from the quiet, genial sally of the man who laughs *with* you while he laughs *at* you, to the biting sarcasm of the satirist, whose keen and often envenomed darts are winged with wrath and indignation. It is this last phase that we shall naturally expect to find most prominent in Dante.

In so far as it is to be expressed by a single Aristotelian word, our subject corresponds most nearly in connotation to the Greek *εὐτραπελία*, that intellectual elasticity and adroitness which seizes instinctively upon the right subjects on which to vent its fun, and handles them with a sure, artistic touch. It stands midway between the vulgarity of the buffoon (*βωμολόχος*) and the insensibility to humour of the downright boor (*ἄγροικος*). Indeed in one place (*Mag. Mor.* I, 31, 1193) this quality of *εὐτραπελία* is described by the Philosopher in terms which practically identify it with our own useful phrase 'A sense of humour.' 'The vulgar buffoon,' he says, 'deems everybody and everything a legitimate mark for a jest, while the boor has no will to jest himself, and to be jested upon makes him angry. The witty man'—the true humorist, as we might say—'avoids both extremes. He selects his subjects—and is not a boor. On the one hand he has the capacity of jesting with decency and decorum'—his jokes do not jar on our good taste—'and on the other, he can bear good humouredly jests of which he is himself the butt[2].'

[1] *Vita*, § 8.

[2] *Mag. Mor.* I, 31, 1193. *εὐτραπελία δ' ἐστὶ μεσότης βωμολοχίας καὶ ἀγροικίας. ὅ τε γάρ βωμολόχος ἐστὶν ὁ πάντα καὶ πᾶν οἰόμενος δεῖν σκώπτειν, ὅ τε ἄγροικος ὁ μήτε σκώπτειν βουλόμενος, μήτε σκωφθῆναι, ἀλλ' ὀργιζόμενος. ὁ δ' εὐτράπελος ἀνὰ μέσον τούτων, ὁ μήτε πάντας καὶ παντῶς σκώπτων, μήτ' αὐτὸς ἄγροικος ὤν. ἔσται δ' ὁ εὐτράπελος διττῶς πως λεγόμενος. καὶ γὰρ ὁ δυνάμενος σκῶψαι ἐμμελῶς, καὶ ὃς ἂν ὑπομείνῃ σκωπτόμενος.*

How far Dante would satisfy the second part of this canon, may perhaps be open to discussion. But this is to anticipate. For the moment it behoves us to observe that a somewhat tedious search in the Berlin Index volume for the passage cited in the *Anatomy of Melancholy* reveals the fact that Burton's 'witty man' is not εὐτράπελος but εὔστοχος[1]. In other words, what Aristotle attributes to the melancholy temperament is inductive acumen, the qualification of the scientific discoverer, rather than a sense of humour. The two qualities have, however, something in common: the gift of seeing and grasping analogies not obvious to the plain man in his plain moments[2]. So this crumb of comfort may hearten us in our quest, although the path be at first sight as unpromising as were certain stages of the Poet's mystical journey.

If then we elect to follow Aristotle, as Dante followed Virgil (and I feel sure the Divine Poet would approve our choice of guide), we may draw one more drop of comfort from a passage in the *Eudemian Ethics*[3], in which the Philosopher, discoursing of friendship, notes how unlike characters often pair off together, 'as austere people with witty ones (εὐτράπελοι).' May we look for this friendly union of playfulness and austerity within a single personality—in the redoubtable person of Dante Alighieri?

Is it not almost as incongruous, it may be asked, to look for humour in the *Divina Commedia* as it would be to search for jokes in the Bible? We are prepared to maintain that even the intense seriousness of Dante—that sublime and solemn earnestness which can only be compared to the temper of Holy Writ, is not merely compatible with a playful use of the intellect, artistically restrained, but is rendered more complete and effective thereby. And what about Holy Scripture itself? I speak with all reverence.

Hebraists assure us that puns and plays on words are far from rare in the Old Testament; and there are, in the Psalms and the Book of Isaiah[4], and elsewhere, passages of which the irony, at once keen and sublime, cannot fail to strike the English reader. Would it not be possible also to quote even from the New Testament—from the

[1] *De divinatione per somnum* II (464ᵃ 33) οἱ δὲ μελαγχολικοὶ διὰ τὸ σφύδρα, ὥσπερ βάλλοντες πόρρωθεν, εὔστοχοι εἰσίν. Cf. *Eth. Nic.* VI, 10 (1142ᵇ 2), where εὐστοχία is distinguished from βούλευσις as 'swift and wordless': ἄνευ τε γὰρ λόγου καὶ ταχύ τι ἡ εὐστοχία. And a little further on it is said that ἀγχίνοια—'ready wit,' 'shrewdness,' is a kind of εὐστοχία.

[2] *Rhet.* III, 11, 1412ᵃ. εὐστοχία sees analogies, like Archytas who says 'a διαιτητής is like an altar'—for to both the injured flee!

[3] *Eth. Eud.* VII, 5, 1240ᵃ 2.

[4] Cf. *Ps.* CXV, 4—8. Esp. *Isaiah* XLIV and XLVI.

Gospels—phrases and metaphors in which the deepest and most solemn truths are cast into a form which, for want of a better word, must be described as playful or witty? The picture of the children in the market place discontented with their games; the ironical description of the 'blind guides of the blind'; and of the pedants who 'strain at a gnat and swallow a camel,' the still more terrible irony of the 'whited sepulchres'—instances like these show that Truth and Wisdom incarnate did not disdain to use the whip wherewith the old Hebrew Prophets had scourged the idolatrous follies of their contemporaries.

In the light of what has just been said, we may perhaps be justified in doubting whether the most perfect presentation of ideas—or at any rate the most surely effective—does not involve of necessity the use of those faculties with which we are at present concerned. 'Without a sense of humour,' it is often said, 'no man can be a perfect Saint.' Surely it is equally true to say that the same quality is essential for a really great man of letters, be he Essayist, Historian or Poet.

One more question before we come to Dante himself. What about the age and place in which the Poet lived? Were the Italians of Dante's time devoid of the spirit of mirth and of the power to express it? Boccaccio and Sacchetti, the *Novellino*, nay, even the Franciscan Legend with its *Joculatores Domini*, and not least the charming *Fioretti*, cry out with one voice against the unjust imputation. But one single name would be enough to vindicate for the Italy of Dante's elder contemporaries, and for the men who figure largely in Dante's writings, the possession of the sense of humour and the gift of wit: Fra Salimbene of Parma, the immortal gossip, who so dearly loves a joke, and is so ready to pardon other failings in the man who has 'a pretty wit.' He peoples the world into which Dante Alighieri was born with folk whose joy in laughter and rollicking sense of fun match in their intensity the sternness, cruelty, savagery of those strange days. And to Florence he accords the palm for wit and humour[1], though not in the strict Aristotelian sense; for Salimbene's Florentines are far from being always seemly and decorous in their jests.

The mirthful spirit that pervades the pages of Salimbene recalls indeed most forcibly a passage of Aristotle to which we have not yet referred, and a definition of *urbanitas* (εὐτραπελία), which, if slightly mysterious, is the most epigrammatic and the most suggestive of all his utterances on the subject.

'The young,' he says in the second book of the *Rhetoric*, 'are

[1] See esp. *op. cit.* pp. 77 sqq. 'Florentini...trufatores maximi sunt.'

laughter-loving, and therefore witty, for wittiness is *πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις*...[1].' How shall we render it? 'A disciplined "cheek",' an 'educated insolence'! The riotous, effervescent self-assertion of the Middle Ages, outcome of abundant vitality, offered splendid raw material for the manufacture of *urbanitas*. The uncontrollable vivacity which vented itself in the field of life sometimes in horseplay or in huge practical jokes; too often in fighting and bloodshed; which vented itself in the field of Art in the fantastically contorted and quaintly humorous subjects of the illuminations with which even sacred MSS. were adorned, and in the carving of grotesque figures in wood or stone:

> Come, per sostentar solaio o tetto
> Per mensola talvolta una figura
> Si vede giunger le ginocchia al petto[2];

and in the field of literature ranged from sheer profanity and lewdness to the edifying if amusing hagiological tales which meet us everywhere in the pages of Tammassia's work upon St Francis[3].

That Dante's own literary circle was not innocent of this *πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις*—*ὕβρις*, that is, more or less *πεπαιδευμένη*—a glance at the dainty little collection in Rossetti's volume will show at once[4]. Not to speak of the famous *Tenzone* or 'literary wrangle' between Dante and Forese Donati, of which the Poet, it would seem, was afterwards ashamed[5]; a group which included the extravagantly humorous Cecco Angiolieri cannot be described as wanting in the 'playful use of the intellect.'

'Del resto,' says Professor Sannia, 'Dante era un toscano, uno fiorentino; che è tutto dire...nella facoltà comica e satirica ei fu degno rappresentante della sua stirpe, il più degno e il più alto: il genio comico e satirico fu in lui impronta, eredità etnica[6].'

And though he fails to cross-examine the Friar of Parma—perhaps the most telling of all witnesses on this point—he has much to adduce to the same effect. Most pertinent is his quotation of D'Ancona's remark that the gay songs with which the streets of old Florence rang were not all love-ditties. Popular poetry was one of the forces which ruled the city, 'Firenze fu un Comune nel quale la poesia era uno dei

[1] *Rhet.* II, 1389[b] 10. *οἱ νέοι...φιλογέλωτες, διὸ καὶ εὐτράπελοι· ἡ γὰρ εὐτραπελία πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις ἐστίν.*

[2] *Purg.* X, 130—3.

[3] Nino Tammassia, *S. Francesco d' Assisi e la sua Leggenda*, Padova, Drucker, 1906. [Eng. Tr. Fisher Unwin, 1910.]

[4] D. G. Rossetti, *The Early Italian Poets, etc.*

[5] *Purg.* XXIII, 115 sqq.

[6] *Op. cit.* pp. 55—6.

pubblici poteri.' It cannot fail to be significant that Dante spent the most impressionable years of his life in a society where the *poesia popolare*, by the inspiration of its eulogy and the stimulus of its satire, took the place of our modern newspapers in the formation, guidance and control of effective public opinion. And if the lessons of Florence were not fully learned at the time—if the *Vita Nuova* may be said by the unsympathetic to reveal something of the prig—the rough and tumble of an exiled life in fourteenth century Italy had no mean share of teaching to offer.

We have thus narrowed the field of observation to Dante himself, and are justified in claiming to have established at the outset at least so much as this: that if Dante was humourless, it was not for want of inspiration in his environment, or of material in the human—the *very* human—spirits among whom he moved.

It is not unnatural to ask first of all, whether Dante's physiognomy has anything to tell us on the subject. Two features act emphatically as index of the movements of the unseen spirit—as the Author himself points out in the *Convivio*[1]—the eyes and the mouth, those 'Balconi della donna che nello edificio del corpo abita.' And though the spirit of pleasantry and humour is apt to reveal itself through these windows chiefly in momentary flashes, the genial temper will usually leave some prominent tokens of its influence more especially about the corners of the mouth. As regards the eye, that most expressive of all our features, no fourteenth century portraiture, however faithful, could hope to reproduce its living flash. Moreover the most authentic portrait of Dante is blind, alas, or rather worse than blind: fitted with an execrable false eye by the much-abused Marini. The pose of Dante's mouth might teach us something, if only we could be sure of it. Mr Holbrook in his recent monograph[2] has confirmed our suspicions about the famous 'Death Mask,' which at best would naturally have furnished nothing more significant than the smile of peace which so often graces our poor clay, a parting gift from the spirit as it leaves.

The magnificent Naples Bust is seemingly, like the so-called 'Death Mask' itself, the creation of some abnormally gifted artist, who derived his inspiration, perhaps indirectly, through the Palatine Miniature (No. 320)[3], from the Bargello portrait to which we have already referred. In vain, therefore, does its splendid physiognomy, completely

[1] *Conv. III*, VIII, 70.

[2] *Portraits of Dante from Giotto to Raffael.* A critical study, with a concise iconography, by Richard Thayer Holbrook. London, Philip Lee Warner, 1911.

[3] Holbrook, *l.c.* pp. 68—72.

human, give such promise of a sense of humour as a face in repose can be expected to give. Nor does it matter for our purpose that the 'Rittratto brutto' (as the Riccardian picture—attached to MS. 1040—is justly styled by some distinguished Florentines) would suggest the bare possibility rather than the probability of a sense of humour; for that work of Art (if it may be so called), is probably derived, like the famous Torrigiani Mask, from the Naples Bust.

The one probably genuine contemporary portrait, the Bargello Fresco, which a merciful criticism still allows us to attribute to Giotto, is only preserved in the drawings of Kirkup and Faltoni. In these, one window of the soul, the eye, is wanting, and there is considerable difference between the two reproductions of that other essential feature, the mouth; where Kirkup has much more of the conventional 'Cupid's Bow[1].' The most that can be said here is what we said of the Naples Bust, that it certainly leaves room for a play of humour, restrained and dignified.

When we pass from portraiture to written record, we have but little material that is really *à propos* in the early biographers of Dante. Boccaccio, after pourtraying his character and features, says 'his expression was ever melancholy and thoughtful'—'nella faccia sempre malinconico e pensoso' (*Vita*, § 8), but goes on to describe him as 'smiling a little'—'sorridendo alquanto' (*ib.*), when he overheard the gossips of Verona commenting on the crisped hair and darkened complexion of the man who 'goes down to Hell and returns at will to bring back word of those below.' Later on in his biography he draws out with evident relish the power of the poet's sarcastic satire: 'with a fine resourcefulness of invention,' says Boccaccio (§ 17), 'he fixes his fangs on the vices of many yet alive and lashes the vices of many that have passed away'—'con invenzione acerbissima morde le colpe di molti viventi e quelle de' preteriti castiga.' And speaking, in an earlier passage, of his courtesy in intercourse with others[2]—'più che alcun altro cortese e civile'—he takes something of the edge off Giovanni Villani's description of a man 'somewhat haughty, reserved and disdainful, and after the fashion of a philosopher, careless of graces and not easy in his intercourse with laymen[3].' Yet we feel all the time that Villani's description is, speaking broadly, the more convincing; and are relieved

[1] Holbrook, *op. cit.* p. 102 and illustration opposite p. 98.

[2] *Vita*, § 8. 'Ne' costumi domestici e pubblici mirabilmente fu ordinato e composto, e in tutti più che un altro cortese e civile.'

[3] *Hist.* IX, 136. 'Per lo suo sapere fu alquanto presuntuoso e schifo e isdegnoso, e quasi a guisa di filosofo mal grazioso. Non bene sapea conversare co' laici.'

when we realise that it is the outwardly and obviously genial temperament rather than the saving sense of humour that the Florentine historian would deny to his great contemporary.

Next, before we turn to the testimony of Dante's own works, we may refer briefly to the stories told of him; for if none of these be incontrovertibly authentic, and not a few of them be comparatively late in origin, their cumulative evidence should be of some value, at any rate in suggesting what his own countrymen of succeeding generations regarded as compatible with the Poet's temperament[1].

We may dismiss, if we will, as apocryphal, the tale of Dante's conversation with the fish at the Venetian Doge's banquet, and of the smearing of his court dress at King Robert's feast; we may reject, perhaps, with more hesitation and regret, Sacchetti's stories of the harmonious but offending blacksmith and the donkey-driver who farced Dante's songs with an interpolated *Arrhi!* We may relinquish the pun on Can Grande's name, while retaining Petrarca's story (of which Michele Savonarola's is possibly a 'doublet') wherein Dante administers a deserved rebuke to Can Grande and his court for their preference of a buffoon to a poet. But even the rejected legends add their quota of testimony to the general and traditional belief that the Divino Poeta could unbend, and was capable of making a joke.

And there is a certain residuum—some would say larger, some smaller—of anecdotes that may be believed to contain a nucleus of truth.

There is to me a convincing ring about the comment of the *Anonimo Fiorentino* on *Purg.* IV, 106. When Belacqua makes excuses for his laziness on the ground of the Aristotelian dictum that 'by repose and quiet the mind attains to wisdom,' Dante retorts: 'Certainly, if repose will make a man wise, you ought to be the wisest man on earth!'

A like readiness of wit, in a moment where all depended on readiness, is evinced in the story of his reply to the Florentine envoy who was sent to Porciano to demand his extradition. 'Is Dante Alighieri still at Porciano?' asked the messenger who met the forewarned exile on the road, in the act of escaping. 'When I was there, he was there,' was the non-self-committing response:—'quand io era, v' era[2].'

[1] Cf. Toynbee, *Dante Alighieri*, Methuen, 3rd ed., 1904, p. 176 sqq.

[2] This is quoted from C. Bruni's excellent *Guida al Casentino*, p. 167. B. does not specify his authorities, but says in a footnote: 'Questo aneddoto è così riferito da varii scrittori danteschi.'

The stories told of Dante, if they do not suggest a genial and convivial temperament, do suggest a ready and caustic wit. But it is time to turn to Dante's own works, and taste for ourselves.

The *Divina Commedia* is the criterion by which most would judge him, and on this we shall spend the bulk of the space at our disposal; but no discussion of this or any other aspect of Dante's literary genius can afford to neglect the field of his minor works, which are, in this particular case, of not a little importance. The *Convivio* (if we may anticipate) supplies us, among other things, with Dante's own idea of what laughter should be; and the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* furnishes a practical illustration of his treatment of a subject like *patois* which lends itself to humorous handling even in a serious treatise.

These three works not only cover a large proportion of Dante's total literary remains, but they are also representative of his three chief styles of writing: Poetry, Italian Prose, and Latin Prose.

In opening the *Divina Commedia* one would venture to issue a further warning on the mistake of limiting the field of observation to the *Inferno*, or of allowing its temper and atmosphere too great a place in our estimate of the characteristics of Dante. Whatever he was to the women of Verona, Alighieri is to us much more than 'the man who goes down to Hell and comes up again at will.' Yet now and then even educated Italians, if you mention Dante's name, are apt to make it clear that they know him mainly as the creator of two episodes—*Paolo and Francesca* and *Conte Ugolino*; and there is a real danger among Englishmen—amply illustrated in Dr Paget Toynbee's *Dante in English Literature*—of laying too much stress on the *Inferno*, even if they do not confine themselves to it.

The humour of the *Inferno* is, of necessity, prevailingly grim; sometimes almost coarsely grotesque. Here we may see the hand of the subtle artist, and detect a deliberate purpose on Dante's part to pour (as I have said elsewhere) 'a disdainful and indignant ridicule upon the futile, monstrous, hideousness of sin.' 'His fine scorn of sin tempts him to heap upon it all the...burden of loathsome grotesqueness that the resources of his imagination can furnish[1].'

Typical of this method is the fierce sport of the scene described in *Inf.* XXII—XXIII, which culminates in the 'nuovo ludo[2]' (puzzlingly compared by Dante to the apocryphal Aesopian Fable of the 'Frog

[1] *Dante and His Italy*, pp. 141, 2.
[2] *Inf.* XXII, 118.

and the Mouse'[1]) in which Ciampolo outwits the Demons and brings them to confusion[2]. We are in mid-Hell, in the fifth *Bolgia* of the eighth circle, *Malebolge*, the place of the *Barattieri*, of those, that is, who have made traffic of justice or of public interests. Dante, who had been falsely accused of this crime, expends all the resources at his command to express his detestation of it, and holds it up at once to ridicule and loathing.

In Purgatory, on the terrace where pride is purged, he seems to acknowledge his appropriate place; but far different is his attitude towards the spot in Hell where his political enemies would fain have placed him.

The whole of these two Cantos and a half is pervaded by an unholy reek of boiling pitch; the appropriate similes are those of frogs immersed to the muzzle in stagnant ditch water[3]; of clawings, flayings, proddings of raw flesh[4]. Here, if anywhere, Dante verges on the vulgar. The names of the Demons are fantastically ridiculous and unpleasantly suggestive; their actions and their gestures, their badinage and their horseplay, all remind one that the stately pageant of the Middle Ages had its unspeakable and unpresentable side. The Cantos are only redeemed from unreadableness by the fine similes, the lofty poetical touches which Dante, because he was Dante, could not but introduce here and there.

The graphic picture of the Venetian arsenal in full activity[5], the swiftly drawn but masterly sketches of the wild duck's dive to escape the swooping falcon[6], of the mother's rescue of her child by night from a flaming house[7]; the vivid reminiscences of Dante's own campaigning days, at Caprona and before Arezzo: these play, like sunlit iridescence on the surface of a noisome pool, where foul creatures sport and gambol in a nightmare fashion.

We must note, however, one point: that Dante never represents himself here as moved to mirth by the fiendish antics he so conscientiously describes. Rather he is pictured as consistently consumed by fear and loathing[8].

More reprehensible from the point of view of good taste is the Poet's eager attention attracted to the vulgar harlequinade between

[1] *Inf.* XXIII, 4 sqq.
[2] Sannia not inappropriately describes this passage as 'il comico populare della D.C.' (p. 193). He should perhaps have excepted *Inf.* XXX, 103.
[3] *Inf.* XXII, 25. [4] *Inf.* XXII, 41, 57, 60, 72, cf. XXI, 55 sqq.
[5] *Inf.* XXI, 7—15. [6] *Inf.* XXII, 130. [7] *Inf.* XXIII, 37.
[8] *Inf.* XXI, 31, 88 sqq., 127 sqq.; XXII, 31.

Master Adam the false-coiner and the Greek Sinon, where the latter strikes the former on his 'inflated paunch' till it resounds

Come fosse un tamburo[1].

But Dante is careful to put things right in the sequel, and makes his own blush of shame respond at once to Virgil's chiding:

...Or pur mira,
Che per poco è che teco non mi risso[2]!

Less broad in its grim playfulness is the taunt which the spendthrift Jacomo da Sant' Andrea, hunted and breathless, gasps out at his fellow-sufferer: 'Lano, at Toppo's jousts thy legs were not so nimble'—

Lano, sì non furo accorte
Le gambe tue alle giostre del Toppo[3]!

Exquisite in the irony of its situation is *Inf.* XIX, in which Dante, in order to find a place for solemn invective against Boniface VIII[4], and to assign him, while still alive, his place in Hell, makes Nicholas III mistake the Poet's voice for that of the Pontiff, and exclaim

Sei tu già costì ritto,
Sei tu già costì ritto, Bonifazio[5]?

Whereat Dante represents himself as quite puzzled, and unable to grasp the speaker's meaning!

Nor is the scene itself without a picturesque absurdity that evinces a subtle sense of humour, especially when we remember the overweening pretensions of Boniface to unearthly dignity. The flaming legs of Simonists kicking to and fro above the surface of the ground wherein the rest of them is buried headforemost; and the neat epigram in which Pope Nicholas describes his plight:

su l' avere, e qui me misi in borsa—

'I pursed wealth above, and here—myself[6].'

Bearing in mind the Poet's solemn and deliberate purpose, as we conceive it, to pour scathing ridicule upon that which qualifies man for a place in Hell, we may fairly aver that even in the most critical scenes and episodes he does not transgress the canons of the Master whom he revered. If there is *βωμολοχία*—unseemly and unrestrained jesting—in his Inferno, it is not Dante's but the Demons'. Dante, as we have seen, deliberately dissociates himself from it; and the absence of all such extravagance from his description of Paradise and even of Purgatory

[1] *Inf.* XXX, 103. [2] *Inf.* XXX, 131, 2. [3] *Inf.* XIII, 120 sqq.
[4] *Inf.* XIX, 52 sqq. Cf. Boccaccio, *Vita*, § 17. [5] *Inf.* XIX, 52 sq.
[6] *Inf.* XIX, 72.

confirms our inference that the humorous element, even at its grimmest and coarsest, is carefully proportioned to the environment with which he is dealing.

The *Purgatorio* and *Paradiso* are marked (like the scene with Nicholas III) by occasional outbursts of political or quasi-political invective, seasoned with stinging satire. In these tirades against Florence or the Papacy Dante is sometimes his own spokesman; sometimes they are put into another mouth.

The concluding verses of *Purg.* VI will at once come to mind: the famous invective in which he ironically congratulates his native city on her 'feverish' energy[1], shown in the disinterested eagerness of her citizens to take up the lucrative burdens of public office, and in the amazing agility of her legislative activity, beside which the democratic traditions of Ancient Athens

> Fecer al viver ben un picciol cenno[2]—

the laws passed in October being superseded by the middle of November—

> ...Che fai tanto sottili
> Provvedimenti, che a mezzo Novembre
> Non giunge quel che tu d' Ottobre fili.

Then there is the scarcely less famous passage in *Par.* XXI[3], where St Peter Damian, inveighing against the Roman Curia, describes the fat Cardinals as supported on every side as they go—held up to right and left, and pushed and pulled along—

> Or voglion quinci e quindi chi rincalzi
> Li moderni pastori, e chi gli meni
> Tanto son gravi, e chi diretro gli alzi.

And when they ride, covering their palfreys with their ample robes, 'so that two beasts are moving 'neath one hide'—

> Sì che due bestie van sott' una pelle[4].

Or again, there is Beatrice's tirade in *Par.* XXIX[5] against the farce of unauthorised indulgences, and against the fashions of the contemporary pulpit: the fashion of neglecting the Gospel, and straining after originality, as though Christ's mandate had been: 'Go ye into all the world, and preach—frivolities!'

> Andate e predicate al mondo ciance[6].

[1] *Purg.* VI, 149.
[2] *Purg.* VI, 141.
[3] *Par.* XXI, 130 sqq.
[4] *Par.* XXI, 134.
[5] *Par.* XXIX, 34 sqq.
[6] *Par.* XXIX, 110.

The modern preacher's 'head is swelled' (if we may so translate 'Gonfia il cappuccio'), and he is perfectly content if by his jests and gibes he can raise a laugh, while the fiend sits unseen in the corner of his hood.

This passage is as perennially applicable as any in Dante, and combines the satire of Alexander Pope with the stern earnestness of the author of the *Task*, so aptly compared to it by W. W. Vernon.

Dante no doubt felt a certain appropriateness which justified him in putting these invectives into the mouths of his august *dramatis personae*: but we are apt to hear the ring of *his* voice in each of them. There are however other passages in the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso* of which the playfulness belongs to the characters themselves.

In *Purg.* xx we have two instances given to show that the risible faculties are not extinguished by the pains of purification.

Greedy Midas' dismal surprise when, in answer to his ill-advised prayer, his very food turned to gold and became uneatable, is a legitimate and unfailing cause of laughter—

Per la qual sempre convien che si rida[1]—

to those who lie fettered face downwards[2] in the terrace of the avaricious. And it is with evident relish that the same souls repeat their last lesson: 'Tell us, Crassus, for thou knowest, what is the flavour of gold?'

Crasso,
Dicci, chè il sai, di che sapore è l' oro[3]?

In the next Cantos, XXI and XXII, the Poet delights us with scenes of a graceful and most appropriate playfulness. First there is the charming episode, *Purg.* XXI, 100 sqq., where Statius addressing Virgil, whom he does not recognise, says: 'What would I have given to have been on earth when the author of the *Aeneid* was alive!' and Dante, in spite of Virgil's unspoken but unmistakable 'Taci!' betrays the situation by an uncontrollable smile. Then in the next Canto (XXII) when the puzzled Virgil mistakes the guilt for which Statius is suffering for *avarice*, it is Statius' turn to laugh. The gentle, mirthful grace of the whole scene is enhanced by the pathetic sequel, when Statius explains that it was Virgil who converted him, by his famous fourth Eclogue, to Christianity, like one who, walking himself in darkness, carries a lantern behind his back to illumine the path of those who follow—

Facesti come quei che va di notte,
Che porta il lume retro, e sè non giova
Ma dopo sè fa le persone dotte[4].

[1] *Purg.* xx, 108.
[2] *Purg.* xix, 72, 124.
[3] *Purg.* xx, 116—17.
[4] *Purg.* xxii, 67—9.

Charming too is the playful irony of the scene in the Earthly Paradise where Matelda gravely discourses to Dante, in presence of Virgil and Statius, about the poets who in days of yore sang of the Golden Age—

> Quelli che anticamente poetaro
> L' età dell' oro e suo stato felice[1]—

and Dante looks round on them and sees them smiling.

> Io mi volsi diretro allora tutto
> A' miei poeti, e vidi che con riso
> Udito avevan l' ultimo costrutto[2].

The smiles which wreathe the lips of the denizens of the Heavenly Paradise, like that which gleams in Beatrice's eyes[3], are something ineffably solemn and sublime: like the *Gloria* chanted in the Starry Heaven, of which the Poet exclaims:

> ...mi sembiava un riso
> Dell' universo[4].

But there is a touch of the more distinctively human in the suggestion thrown out in the following Canto that St Gregory woke up in heaven to the true facts about the Angelic Hierarchy, and 'smiled at his own mistake' in departing from the Dionysian scheme.

> Onde, sì tosto come l' occhio aperse
> In questo ciel, di sè medesmo rise[5].

The passages we have touched upon in the *Divina Commedia* are those most obviously to the point. Professor Sannia's Italian mind can discern subtleties of humour in places where the foreigner cannot always hope to follow. But there is one point on which he lays much stress, namely the importance, for our purpose, of observing Dante's attitude towards himself throughout the mystical journey, and especially as he passes through the dismal regions of the First Kingdom. The Dante so graphically depicted to us in the Divine Comedy is altogether different from the cold, abstract Dante of tradition. He is an impatiently curious child, in whom the passion of curiosity even conquers fear. And while the pilgrim is depicted to us in very human guise, and his motions and his attitudes described in terms which presuppose not only a remarkable degree of self-knowledge, and a striking power of psychological analysis, but also a very real sense of humour; the poet, who sings of the pilgrim, reveals to us by the way a whole group of characteristics which claim the humorous gift as their inevitable

[1] *Purg.* XXVIII, 139. [2] *Purg.* XXVIII, 145. [3] *Par.* XXIII, 22.
[4] *Par.* XXVII, 4. [5] *Par.* XXVIII, 134, 5.

associate. Such are his broad humanity, his sympathy, his reverence even for the noble damned, his very modern type of tenderness shown by interest in the ways of children, animals, birds, insects, from whose life he loves to draw his similes.

Popular tradition has imaged him as a heartless, unfeeling judge, without that indulgence towards human frailty which the gift of humour presupposes: but the entire *Purgatorio* belies this calumny, and not a few episodes in the *Inferno* itself.

To pass from the *Divina Commedia* to the *Convivio* is in any case a drop down. If it is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous, the sublimity of the *Divina Commedia* should bring us very close to the regions where laughter is generated. The *Convivio*, with all its manifold interest, is obviously far below the level on which thought and feeling habitually move in the Divine Comedy. Has it therefore less promise in the matter of our quest?

I venture to think that there is a strain of playfulness underlying a good deal of the argument of this work: and that, even if we can bring ourselves to believe Dante's own solemnly elaborate interpretation of his love-songs to be quite serious in the main.

And apart from this, if we take the *Convivio* with the utmost seriousness, we may remember for our comfort that *πορίζεσθαι τὰ γέλοια*[1] is one of the qualifications of Aristotle's *εὐτράπελος* and the willingness to be laughed at another; and see in Dante (with all reverence) an example of those who, more or less unconsciously, provide matter for amusement to posterity. Nay, we may treat him as he treats St Gregory, and look upon him as laughing now at his own certitude about the ten heavens and the angelic hierarchy, from his place in the mystic rose—or are we to say on the terrace of Pride?

But to return to the *Convivio*. It is here, as we have already suggested, that Dante gives us his description of the ideal nature of Laughter. 'Ridere,' he says, 'è una corruscazione della dilettazione dell' anima[2].' On the Aristotelian principle of the Mean (though his actual reference is not to Aristotle, but to Pseudo-Seneca 'On the Four Cardinal Virtues'), he urges that laughter should be moderate and modest, with no violent movement (such as convulses the pages, e.g., of Franco Sacchetti) and no 'cackling' noise. Laughter is, in fact—like little children—'best seen and not heard.'

[1] *Eth. Eud.* III, 1234[a] 17.
[2] *Conv. III*, VIII, 95 sqq.

From each of the four extant treatises, quotations may be adduced which at any rate show the writer's sympathy with that view of life which fastens on the incongruous and sees in it matter for genial irony or for bitter sarcasm, according to the moral context.

Tratt. I. Chapter XI opens with a delicious satire on the 'sheep-like opinion' of the multitude, which I have elsewhere compared to the charmingly nonsensical scene—'Less Bread, More Taxes!'—with which Lewis Carroll inaugurates his *Sylvie and Bruno*. The 'man in the street,' says Dante, is ready to follow any cry that is raised. Thus the populace will be found exclaiming 'Viva la lor morte! Muoia la lor vita!—purchè alcuno cominci.' They are for all the world like sheep who follow their leader blindly over a high precipice or down a well. He goes on to rail at 'a bad workman who blames his tools,' the many who 'sempre danno colpa alla materia dell' arte apparecchiata, ovvero allo stromento; siccome il fabro biasima il ferro appresentato a lui.'

Nor can we fail to find in the next chapter (I, XII) a touch of the drily humorous spirit; in the passage which Dr Toynbee in his Anthology[1] entitles *Of Silly Questions.*

'If flames were plainly to be seen issuing from the windows of a house, and a bystander were to enquire whether that house were on fire, and another man to reply that it was, I should find it difficult to decide which of the two was the more ridiculous.'

What are we to say of the *Trattato II*? Here, if anywhere, Dante poses as the unconscious humorist; here, if anywhere, in his elaborately solemn disquisition upon the arrangement of the heavens and their analogues in the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, he is qualifying himself to play the rôle of St Gregory in the other world! But even here he finds leisure to cast occasionally a satirist's eye on the contemporary world,

l' aiuolo che ci fa tanto feroci;

and the naïveté of his references to it is delightful. They sometimes come in incidentally in the form of similes. In Chapter VII, for instance, is an allusion to the perennial banishments and sieges with which the factions of Guelf and Ghibelline, Black and White, harassed the cities of the peninsula: 'When we speak of "the city",' he says, 'we are wont to mean those who are in possession of it, not those who are attacking it, albeit the one and the other be citizens.' Or again, in Chapter XI[2], a reference to the decline of good taste and culture is

[1] *In the Footprints of Dante* (Methuen, 1907), p. 303.
[2] *II*, XI, 60 sqq.

ingeniously worked into a question of etymology. 'Cortesia' is equivalent to 'onestade,' and 'because in courts of old time virtuous and fair manners were in use (as now the contrary), this word was derived from courts, and "courtesy" was as much as to say "after the usage of courts." If the word had been derived in modern days from the same origin, it could have signified nothing else than *turpezza*.'

In *Tratt. III*, as elsewhere, the playfulness is for the most part so spread out that it is difficult to quote. There is, however, a touch of real satire in such passages as that in which Dante twits the lawyers, physicians, and members of religious orders with their disqualification for the reputation of a true philosopher (XI, 100 sqq.).

'We are not to call him a real philosopher who is a friend of wisdom for profit['s sake], as are lawyers, physicians, and almost all the members of the religious orders, who do not study in order to know, but in order to get money or office; and if any one would give them that which it is their purpose to acquire, they would linger over their study no longer.'

Trattato IV is more obviously fruitful. Here again he girds at the lawyers and doctors, suggesting that they might at least give *un*professional advice gratis, and, in another place, ventures timidly to assert that it may be possible 'to be religious though married[1].' Again, in Ch. XVI, if *nobile* simply meant *notus*, then the Obelisk of St Peter would be the noblest stone on earth, and Asdente the cobbler (of whom Salimbene gives us so lively a sketch) would be noblest among the citizens of Parma[2].

Some arguments are so senseless, he says a little earlier, that they deserve to be answered not with a word, but with a knife. 'Risponder si vorrebbe non colle parole ma col cottello a tanta bestialità[3].'

Lastly, he has in this treatise the audacity to depict to us the sublimest sage, 'il maestro di color che sanno,' as indulging in a burst of hypothetical laughter at the idea of a double origin of the human race. 'Senza dubbio, forte riderebbe Aristotile'; and, he adds, 'those who would divide mankind into two separate species like horses and asses are (with apologies to Aristotle) themselves the asses.'

In the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, as we have already hinted, the 'idioma incomptum et ineptum' of various localities, alike on the right and on the left of the Apennines, gives play for pleasantry of which Dante does not fail to take advantage. It is with evident relish that he puts on record typical uncouth phrases of each dialect:—the Roman

[1] *IV*, XXVIII, 70 sqq.
[2] *IV*, XVI, 69. Salimbene (ed. cit.), pp. 457, 512, 530 sqq.
[3] *IV*, XIV, 105.

'Me sure, quinte dici[1],' the 'Chignamente sciate siate' of the Marches of Ancona[2], the Milanese 'Mes d' ochiover[3],' the 'Ces fastù' which men of Aquileja and Istria 'crudeliter accentuando, eructant[4].' The feminine softness of the Romagna, and especially of Forlì, with its 'corada mea[5]'; the more than masculine roughness of the men of Verona, Vicenza, Brescia—all those who say 'Magara[6]'; the 'nof' and 'vif' of Treviso[7].

In Chapter XI he has his knife into mediaeval Rome, the proud and corrupt. 'Sicut ergo Romani se cunctis praeponendos existimant, in hac eradicatione sive discerptione non immerito eos aliis praeponamus, protestantes eosdem in nulla vulgaris eloquentiae ratione fore tangendos.' The primacy which the Romans claim in all things may certainly be theirs in this. In our eliminating process they shall be first to be rejected from the candidature to furnish a classical vernacular for all Italy.

Their dialect (he goes on), like their morals, is the most degraded in the whole peninsula, and has spread its corrupting influence into neighbouring districts[8]. It is indeed not worthy to be called a 'vulgare' (vernacular), but rather a depraved misuse of speech (*tristiloquium*), and is 'italorum vulgarium omnium...turpissimum.'

At the end of Chapter XIII he tilts at the Genoese *Z*—an ugly sound in itself, but one which, if lost or mislaid by defect of memory, would leave the poor people of Genoa without a means of transmitting their thoughts! The loss of this one letter would leave them dumb, or impose on them the necessity of inventing an entirely new mode of speech. 'Si per oblivionem Ianuenses ammitterent *z* litteram, vel mutire totaliter eos vel novam reperire oporteret loquelam: est enim *z* maxima pars eorum locutionis: quae quidem littera non sine multa rigiditate profertur[9].'

On a different plane is Dante's lamentation in Ch. XII over the decay of literary culture in Sicily since the glorious days of Frederic and Manfred, which gave the title 'Sicilianum' to the work of Dante's predecessors in the vernacular: a passage (to me at least) somewhat obscure, in which Frederic II of Sicily, Charles II of Naples, Azzo Marquis of Este, and John Marquis of Montferrat are accused of blood-thirstiness, treachery and avarice: 'Venite carnifices; venite atriplices; venite avaritiae sectatores...[10].'

[1] *I*, x, 17. [2] *I*, x, 19. [3] *I*, x, 35. [4] *I*, x, 36—7.
[5] *I*, XIV, 7—17. [6] *I*, XIV, 20—26. [7] *I*, XIV, 30 sqq.
[8] *V.E.* I, XII. [9] *V.E.* I, XIII, *fin.*
[10] 'Quid nunc personat tuba novissimi Frederici? quid tintinnabulum secundi Caroli? quid cornua Iohannis et Azzonis marchionum potentum? quid aliorum magnatum tibiae? nisi *Venite carnifices, etc.*'

Turning to Bk II we find the same Azzo ironically praised in Chapter VI, in a 'copy-book phrase' of which the incidental introduction gives point to the satire: 'Laudabilis discretio marchionis Estensis et sua magnificentia praeparata cunctis illum facit esse dilectum[1].'

More delightful still is a sentence which closely follows, quoted solemnly like the former merely as an example of good phraseology appropriate to a lofty subject, in which Charles of Valois plays the rôle of a 'second Totila,' and his calamitous dealings with Florence (including, presumably, Dante's own banishment) are adduced as a fitting prelude to his futile descent upon Sicily. 'Ejecta maxima parte florum de sinu tuo, Florentia, nequicquam Trinacriam Totila serus adivit[2].'

Earlier in the book there is another humorous touch with which we may conclude our list, at the risk, perchance, of an anti-climax. A passage near the end of Chapter I recalls, in a curious way, a line from the *Epistles* of Horace.

Dante, having premised that every one should adorn (*exornare*) his verses as far as possible, goes on to point out that there are limits beyond which adornment becomes incongruous and absurd. 'We do not speak of an ox caparisoned like a horse or a belted pig as *ornatus*; we laugh at them, and would rather apply the word *deturpatus*.' This *bos ephippiatus* most aptly typifies incongruity of adornment. In Horace's well-known line

Optat ephippia bos piger, optat arare caballus[3],

the point of the satire is different. It is the Roman poet's favourite theme of universal discontent—each envying another's lot.

In Dante's phrase we may perhaps detect an unconscious or semi-conscious adoption or adaptation of a classical image: parallel, in a humble way, with those splendid thefts from Virgil and Ovid with which he has enriched the *Divina Commedia*: conceptions too unquestionably original in their new form to be classed as mere plagiarisms.

'Cicero hath observed,' says the *Spectator* of Nov. 5, 1714[4], 'that a jest is never uttered with a better grace than when it is accompanied with a serious countenance.'

If this be true, our quest may perhaps modestly congratulate itself on the avoidance of undue levity. Nor need we take it seriously to

[1] *V.E.* II, VI, 42—4.
[2] II. VI, 46.
[3] Hor. *Ep.* I, XIV, 43.
[4] No. 616.

heart if we have failed to vindicate for Dante the character of a humorist in the modern sense, and of the American type. The most that our investigation can be said to have proved is that Dante, embittered as he was by his exile, and emaciated by long and serious study, was not devoid of that sense of humour whereby man is able to wring matter for cheerfulness and mirth out of the most unlikely material, and, going through this vale of misery—'questo aspro diserto' —to 'use it for a well.' But neither is he the cold abstraction, both less and more than human, which tradition, of a sort, has handed down to us. His works display, for those who care to look for them, a breadth of sympathy, a capacity for observation and discernment, a keenness of interest, an eye for the incongruous, a richness and sureness of self-expression that are guarantees of the possession of the sense of humour. The manifold play of the forces of one of the most picturesque ages of human history found a sympathetic response in Dante's genius, though the sublimity and the restraint of his work has obscured this. This side of his genius is well summed up by Sannia.

'La coscienza lucidissima di sè stesso, l' attitudine all' analisi psicologica, la febbrile curiosità del mondo esterno, naturale ed umano, lo spirito d' osservazione, il senso più squisito dell' arte, la divina serenità, la multiforme impressionabilità dell' artista, il senso del tenero, la pietà umana, il pessimismo furono note spiccatissime, eminenti del suo genio.'

Lonsdale Ragg.

Green's Norton,
Towcester.

DONNIANA.

In that almost forgotten journal *The Modern Language Quarterly* (IV, 91), I gave under the above title some notes on Mr Gosse's *Life and Letters of John Donne*. Having now re-read that most interesting book, I venture to send a few more notes on it.

I, p. 134. Donne is said to owe nothing to Shakespeare. It is possible however that his phrase 'Th' expense of brain and spirit' (*Progress of the Soul*, stanza 5) is a reminiscence of Shakespeare's Sonnet CXXIX, l. 1, and the line 'She to whom all this world was but a stage' (*Second Anniversary*, l. 67) of *As You Like It*. One may also think that a passage in the *Funeral Elegy* (ll. 21—25) was suggested by the almost contemporary *Coriolanus* (I, 1, 105—107 and the Fable of the Belly).

p. 187. Lancelot Andrews is said by Mr Gosse to have been 'by eight years Donne's senior.' Should not 'eight' be 'eighteen'?

p. 189. The fragment of a letter 'Probably to Sir H. Goodyer' 'From my Hospital at Mitcham, August 10' is here assigned to the year 1608. The same passage, however, with the slightest possible verbal differences, occurs in a letter 'To the Honourable Sir R. D[rury]' printed in vol. II, p. 36 as written in February or March, 1614. Does the letter really belong to the latter date? and was it written at Mitcham? And, if so, must we not assume that Donne, even after his acquaintance with Drury and his obtaining rooms at Drury House, still kept up his old Mitcham home, or returned to it after an interval? A letter of 17th July, 1613 (II, 16, 17) is dated 'From my Hospital' and another of 28th July, 1614 (II, 46, 47) 'At my poor hospital.' Does this throw any light on the mystery of Donne's relations with Sir R. Drury, which Mr Gosse points out (II, 53)? 'We are to believe that since 1610 he had been, with all his family, the guests of [Drury]. Yet no mention of Sir Robert or Lady Drury is to be found in Donne's copious correspondence, with the exception of one colourless letter... Were it not that experience teaches us that those with whom we are

in daily intercourse are those of whom our letters, sometimes, speak the least, we should be tempted to think the lodgings in Drury House a myth.'

p. 200, middle. Mr Gosse says that 'M. Mole,' mentioned in Donne's previous letter, 'may doubtless be identified with Mathieu Molé the President.' The man referred to is however John Mole or Molle. See L. Pearsall Smith's *Life and Letters of Sir H. Wotton*, II, 473.

p. 203, l. 16 from bottom, 'this would be the worst degree of the ill-fortune if that fail.' Query 'of that fail [= failure]'? The substantive 'fail' is used repeatedly by Shakespeare.

p. 203, l. 10 from bottom, 'to live in your memory is advancement enough, and I shall by your Lordship's favour be bold to refresh by my often letters.' We ought probably to read 'refresh it.'

p. 217, l. 11 from bottom. Either emend 'having' to 'have,' or begin the sentence 'Except you repent... and continue to 'so ill.'

p. 223, 'our soul, which is but one, hath swallowed up a negative and feeling soul.' 'Negative' should be 'vegetive' or 'vegetative.' Donne is referring to the triple division of souls thus stated by Jo. Seton in his *Dialectica*:

Vegetatiua Sensitiua Rationalis	Vita triplex attribuitur	Plantis brutis hominibus Brutis & hominibus Homini tantum.

Cp. Donne's *Anatomy*, II, 160: those two souls which then thou [my soul] found'st in me, My second soul of sense and first of growth: *Verse Letter to the Countess of Salisbury*, 52:

> We first have souls of growth and sense: and those
> When our last soul, our soul immortal, came,
> Were swallowed into it, and have no name.

p. 302, l. 7 from bottom, 'the magnificence which have been here.' Query, 'magnificoes'?

p. 307. 'Monsieur de Rohan...son in law to D. Sally,' i.e. to the Duke of Sully. This is Henri, Duc de Rohan, who among other things was godfather to Charles I.

p. 315, l. 2, 'we charged our whole gests.' For 'charged' read 'changed.'

II, p. 8, l. 11 from bottom, '*comite*.' Query '*comiti*'?

p. 16, middle, 'I did your commandment with Mr Johnson, etc.' This is an interesting reference to some objection taken about July, 1613 to some work of Ben Jonson, which led him to change its name. I learn from Mr Percy Simpson that it has not hitherto been noted.

p. 29, l. 4. 'Mr M.' is clearly Albertus Morton.

p. 41, l. 10, 'whatsoever to appear to me.' Query 'whatsoever should [or 'do'] appear to me'? The sentence runs on over the close of the paragraph.

p. 46, l. 9 from bottom, 'in your business.' Query 'in their business' ('their' in the MS. being probably 'y^{r}').

p. 51. If this letter were addressed to Somerset, would it open with 'Sir'?

p. 71, l. 5 from bottom. Butler is no doubt the Cambridge physician.

p. 94, l. 10, 'dies' should be 'die.'

p. 125, bottom. Mr Gosse says of the letter which follows: 'Whether it was, indeed, written to Sir Thomas Lucy I greatly doubt; the tone is more that of a letter to Sir Henry Goodyear. No verse-letter which can be identified with that which is here announced, exists addressed to either friend.'

The letter (whether its recipient was Lucy or Goodyear) was clearly addressed to the same person as the letter on p. 121 which is superscribed 'To Sir H. Goodyer at Polesworth.'

The second sentence which I quoted from Mr Gosse rests on a misunderstanding. There is no question of any 'verse-letter...addressed to either friend.' Goodyear [or Lucy] had asked Donne to write an elegy on a Mr Martin. Donne has found himself unequal to doing so—but encloses to his correspondent 'to his own condemnation' a verse-letter which he had received from a very busy man.

p. 143, l. 11 from bottom, 'since by retiring.' Query 'since his retiring'?

p. 150. This letter is addressed to Sir Thomas Lucy and the one following it to Sir H. G[oodyer]. Yet it seems obvious that the two were written to the same person. This seems to dispose of Mr Gosse's suggestion that Donne's 'little book of Cases' mentioned in the postscript to the former letter was identical with his *Paradoxes and Problems*.

p. 170, middle. 'Why Sir Francis Nethersole should be imprisoned for debt etc.' I think the man imprisoned (pp. 166, 167, 171) was not Nethersole, Goodyer's son-in-law (though called 'his son' on p. 171), but his actual son, John Goodyer, who was still alive at this time (cp. p. 248).

p. 179, l. 8 from bottom, 'jests' = 'gests.'

p. 208, bottom. 'He preached on the 13th of June (1624) to the new Earl of Exeter, William Cecil and his company in his chapel of

St John's.' This chapel is, I suppose, the chapel of St John the Baptist, Westminster Abbey, in which the first Earl (ob. 7 Feb. 1622) had been buried, and where a great monument was (perhaps already) erected in memory of him.

p. 210, middle. 'The address of this letter is very extraordinary.' Is there, however, anything to show that it belongs to the year 1624?

p. 222. Mr Gosse thinks this letter 'may possibly be addressed to Dorset.' It is clearly written however to someone who had lately come into 'a place,' and who at the time was living in a monastery abroad on account of the prevalence of plague where he was, 2000 people dying a day as against 1000 dying in London at the same time.

Is it possible that the recipient of the letter was Sir Isaac Wake, who had lately succeeded Sir H. Wotton at Venice? The fact that he is addressed as 'Your Lordship' would be accounted for by his being an Ambassador. Cp. the letter to Sir T. Roe, p. 173. Donne had no doubt met Wake in the course of his diplomatic travels in Germany with Lord Doncaster in 1619. (Cp. p. 127, l. 4 from bottom.)

Against this suggestion are Donne's words 'I owe no man more.' I am not aware of any obligation to Wake which would account for them. Again Wake went to Venice in May 1624, and we should judge from Donne's letter that his friend's appointment had been more recent. There had been rumours that the unknown correspondent was to be Secretary. This would be, as Mr Gosse says, in the place of Sir Albertus Morton, who had died on the 6th of September 1625, this letter being written on the 25th of November following. I do not know if there is any other evidence of Wake's having been thought of in this connexion.

A last piece of evidence is ambiguous. Donne tells his friend that a protégé whom Donne had recommended to him 'hath embraced another employment for Savoy.' If these words mean 'another employment instead of Savoy,' they practically prove that Wake is the person addressed: as he was accredited not only to Venice, but also to Savoy. If they mean 'another employment, viz. one in Savoy,' they prove as decisively that Wake was not Donne's correspondent, as there would then have been no need for Donne to give Wake the information.

p. 223, l. 7, 'to be as near as I could to your inspection of the Church, I removed for a time to Chelsea.' Query 'to the inspection of the Church'? Cp. p. 270, l. 12: 'to be nearer to the service of the Church...I purpose to be at London.'

p. 224. The persons referred to in the first paragraph are no doubt

Buckingham and John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, who had just been removed from the office of Lord Keeper.

p. 224, ll. 14, 13 from bottom. 'Amongst your men-midwives I shall always assist it with my humble prayers both for the birth of your daughter and your honour in this world and of your son with your happiness in the next.' Query 'the birth of your daughter, your honour in this world, and of your son, your happiness in the next'? The metaphorical use of 'daughter' and 'son' seems to have been misunderstood, and the words 'and' and 'with' inserted.

p. 226. Donne writes in a letter of '21 December [1625]' (the year is no doubt right): 'I never went to Knolle nor Hanworth nor Keton, nor to the Court since the Court came into these quarters.' For 'Keton' (this is apparently the form found in the *Letters* of 1651) Mr Gosse prints 'Ke[ys]ton.' He tells us however (II, 156) that Donne had been obliged to relinquish the living of Keyston in 1622. There would seem no reason therefore why he should go there in 1625, and he is hardly likely to have written 'Keton' if he meant 'Keyston.'

Probably like Knole and Hanworth it was some place much nearer London than Keystone near Thrapstone.

p. 241, l. 9 from bottom, 'at this miserable chezmey.' Did not Donne write 'chez moy'?

p. 245, l. 10, 'the breaking of the bed of whisperers by casting in a bone of making them suspect and distrust one another.' Query, for 'bed' read 'band'?

p. 280. The lines

> As west and east
> In all flat maps—and I am one—are one,

seem to point to the poem's having been written as the Julius Cæsar MS. says, in the Dean's 'great sickness in December 1623' and not (as Walton gives) on March 23, 1631. Cp. the letter to Sir R. Ker (p. 191), dated by Mr Gosse in Feb. or March, 1624: 'if a flat map be but pasted upon a round globe, the farthest east and the farthest west meet and are all one.' The fancy however also occurs in Donne's lines *The Annunciation and Passion* (written on 25th March 1608, when Good Friday coincided with Lady Day):—'As in plain maps, the furthest east is west'—and once again, as Professor Grierson informs me, in one of Donne's sermons.

p. 306, l. 7. 'And save his body in the grave hath none.' Mr E. K. Chambers' text, 'and sure his body,' etc. is obviously the right one.

p. 315. 'No letters of Wotton to Donne have been preserved, and very few of Donne to Wotton.'

Mr L. Pearsall Smith (*Life of Wotton*, II, 469) says he has found a number of letters of Donne to Wotton in the Burley Commonplace book, which he hopes will soon be published.

Two suggestions which I made in *The Modern Language Quarterly*, those on I, 279 and II, 209, I now withdraw.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

TWO POEMS ATTRIBUTED TO THEODOR KÖRNER.

I.

In the *Revue Germanique* for 1907, C. Pitollet[1] reprints from the *Hermann, Deutsches Wochenblatt aus London* for August 29, 1863 the following poem attributed to Körner from a MS. in the possession of Herr von Erlanger:

Den ew'gen Ruhm erkämpfte sich
Jüngst eine brave Schaar,
Als Preussens Heer bei Halle wich,
Und Frankreich Sieger war.

Die Preussen waren längst entflohn
Und ihre Fahne sank,
Die Franken, sie erhoben schon
Den frechen Siegsgesang.

Da stand ein braves Regiment
Dem Feind' im Angesicht,
Als wenn es da auf immer ständ',
Es wich und wankte nicht.

Schon mancher war ihm weggerafft,
Das Häuflein war zu klein,
Es stürzten mit vereinter Krafft
Die Franken auf sie ein.

Sie standen, ihrer Väter werth,
Der Feinde Übermacht,
Und mancher fiel durch Preussens Schwert
In tiefe Todes-Nacht.

Und heisser werden sie bedrängt
Von tapf'rer Franken Hand,
Und endlich doch zurückgedrängt
Bis an der Saale Rand.

Und keine Rettung war nun mehr,
Denn hinten war die Fluth...
Im Angesicht der Feinde Heer,
Den Kriegern sank der Muth.

Die Franken dringen schärfer ein,
Der Preussen Führer fällt,
Da hüllt sich in die Fahne ein
Der Jüngling, der sie hält.

[1] *Revue Germanique*, Vol. III, 1907, p. 231. C. Pitollet, *Une poésie inconnue de Theodor Körner.*

Und es erfasst sie fürchterlich,
Als wär's sein einzig Gut,
Und in die Saale stürzt er sich!
Weh! ihn verschlingt die Fluth.

Und wie er in die Wellen sinkt,
Wie ihn der Strom entrafft
Im Laufe, neuer Muth durchdringt
Die Schaar und neue Krafft.

Sie schwöret, sich dem Tod zu weihn,
Zu fechten als ein Held,
Und stürzt sich in die Franken ein,
Bis jeder Preusse fällt.

All efforts to trace the MS. of this poem failed. Although it was therefore impossible to make comparisons of the handwriting, there is much internal evidence to show that it is most unlikely that Körner was its author.

In the consideration of this and the following poem I only take such compositions into account as Körner wrote after his conversion to the revolutionary, religio-patriotic doctrine of Freiherr von Stein and E. M. Arndt about February 1813. There is no doubt that this poem was composed at a later date, for the battle between the Prussians and French at Halle to which it refers, only took place in May 1813.

Firstly, the poem is epic, and realistic in character. Körner, however, wrote no epic war-poems at all, so far as we know. He did base some of his lyrics on historical events during this period or the immediately preceding one. Such are *Hoch lebe das Haus Österreich*[1], which bears the sub-title *Aus der Geschichte der Schlacht von Aspern*; *Moskau*[2], a sonnet; and *Wilknitz*[3]. A single typical quotation will show how completely all these neglect the actual course of events, to pass into an exalted style and an idealistic contemplation of the action. The poem *Wilknitz*, which glorifies a companion in arms of Körner, opens:

Steig, Flügelross, den Sturm in deinen Mähnen!
Fleug auf, mein Lied, mit deinem kühnsten Schwung!
Zu dir, mein Held, zu dir, des Liedes Sehnen,
Zu deinem Licht aus meiner Dämmerung!
Und füllen gleich die Augen sich mit Tränen,
Dir gleich zu sein, bleibt doch mein stolzes Wähnen.

The contrast to the simple opening of the poem under consideration is apparent.

Of all historical subjects, however, that which recorded so complete a disaster for the Prussians is the very last Arndt or Körner would have treated poetically. The event would rather have called from them a

[1] *Leier und Schwert*, No. 6. Körner's *Werke* (Leipzig, Hesse, 1903), p. 6.
[2] *Leier und Schwert*, No. 10. *Werke*, p. 10. [3] *Werke*, p. 38.

Trost[1]. Other important characteristics of Körner's work are wholly lacking. There is the high religious sentiment which permeates *Leier und Schwert*; the hatred of the enemy which grants them no virtues[2]; the idea that freedom must be won for the Fatherland at the price of life; the glorification of this resolve; the appeal to all 'brothers' to take part; and the personal identification with the crusade. Our poem merely relates, with a simplicity approaching that of the Volkslied, the events of the disaster. Even where Körner depicts a scene in which he had no part, his strong personal feeling forces him to take up an ideal rôle, as in the closing lines of the quotation from *Wilknitz* above.

Certain technicalities also speak against Körner's authorship. (*a*) He was not fond of the simple Chevy-chace metre of our poem. True, he has used it twice, but with the strophe doubled to give an eight-lined verse, and probably *Trost. Ein Rundgesang* (*L. und S.* No. 12), as well as *Reiterlied* (No. 26), was based rather on the Volkslied, *Es gibt nichts Lust'gers auf der Welt*, than on the English verse-form made popular by Klopstock and Gleim. When not following the melody of a regimental song, Körner preferred classical forms, or original ones, as in *Gebet während der Schlacht* and *Missmuth* (*L. und S.* Nos. 23 and 24). (*b*) He indulged very little in enjambement. In any case such extreme examples of it as v. 8, 3—4 and v. 10, 2—3 above, are not discoverable in his war-poetry. (*c*) Körner's répertoire of rhymes during this period is none too large. As I shall show elsewhere, he learned the use of what I may call the topical rhyme—with 'Schwert,' 'Krieg,' 'Leiche,' 'Vaterland,' etc.—largely from Arndt. A comparison of the topical rhymes of *Leier und Schwert* with those before us reveals almost no common material. Only the rhyme of 'weggerafft' : 'Krafft' occurs with both (above v. 4; *L. und S.* No. 12, 2. Cf. v. 10 above and *L. und S.* No. 21, 3). The rhyme 'Schwert' : 'werth' (v. 5 above), although he uses 'Schwert(e)' so frequently in rhyme (*L. und S.* Nos. 15, 1; 16; 19; 23, 5; 26, 2; 20; 26, 6 etc.) never once occurs with Körner. The topical word 'Muth' is rhymed above with 'Fluth' (v. 7, cf. v. 9). In all possible combinations (:'Blut,' *L. und S.* Nos. 12, 1, 8; 26, 2; 18, 3; 19, 4, 6; :'Gut,' 12, 5; 3, 3; :'Glut,' 11, 3; 15, 3; :'Brut,' 15, 2) Körner never once uses it rhymed with 'Fluth.' He does not use the word 'Fluth' at all. In his reference to the Rhine, etc., he uses 'Strom' (*L. und S.* Nos. 19, 5; 32, 6; 18, 2; 24, 4), and that not in rhyme. Similarly,

[1] E. M. Arndt, *Lieder für Teutsche*, Leipzig, 1813; *Trostlieder*, p. 53 ff. and others. Körner, *Trost* (*L. und S.* No. 27) and *Letzter Trost* (No. 21).

[2] Evidenced by such epithets as *Bluthund* (*L. und S.* No. 9, 5 etc.), *Wütrich* (very common) etc. Cf. with these the honesty of our poem, vv. 4, 5 and 6.

'Rand' (:'Hand' v. 6 above) for the bank of a stream is unknown to him. In a poem of 1811 he has 'Strand(e)' in rhyme (*L. und S.* No. 5, 3); uses 'Ufer' once in the middle of a line (*L. und S.* No. 29, 3); and rhymes 'Hand' : 'Vaterland' only (*L. und S.* No. 9, 4; 24, 4; *An L., Werke,* p. 36). The simple word 'sich' (above v. 1, and 9) is never used in rhyme by Körner, though he uses 'mich' and 'dich' (No. 23, etc.). (*d*) I have already drawn attention to two words in the poem under consideration which do not occur in Körner's vocabulary, and have to add 'Preussen' (v. 1, 2, 8, 11 above), for which he puts 'die Deutschen' or 'Deutschland,' except in one reference to the Königin Luise (No. 17, 1); 'Regiment,' for which he uses 'Korps' in his correspondence and in the title, *L. und S.* No. 11, or some more poetic term in his compositions, as *Die Jagd* (*L. und S.* No. 29), 'Brüder,' etc.; and 'Häuflein' (v. 4) and 'Krieger' (v. 7) similarly are unrepresented with him, because he did not refer to the ordinary warfare of soldiers and armies, but to the voluntary struggle of a nation. He speaks therefore of 'das Volk' (Nos. 34, 1; 25 etc.), 'Söhne des Vaterlands' (Nos. 35, 3; 11, 2 etc.), etc. but he uses the first person so much in his capacity as fellow-fighter that synonyma are few.

II.

The second poem attributed to Körner which I have to discuss is a printed leaflet occurring in the British Museum as No. 11528 h 34 (10). It consists of two leaves, $4 \times 6\frac{3}{5}$ in. The first page has the title, *Das eiserne Kreuz.* The second has the following paragraph:

Man kennt den Zweck, der der Errichtung des Ordens des eisernen Kreuzes in den preussischen Staaten zum Grunde liegt. Der Orden wurde im März v. J. errichtet, als Preussen gegen Frankreich den Krieg erklärte, mit der ausdrücklichen Bestimmung, dass nur während der Dauer des gegenwärtigen Krieges dies Ordenszeichen verliehen werden soll, um den Tapfern, die damit geziert sind, zu einem ehrenvollen Andenken an die Tage der Gefahr zu dienen, wo sie für das Vaterland und für die Rettung der deutschen Nationalehre und Selbstständigkeit mitgefochten.

In dieser Beziehung theilt man nachfolgendes Gedicht mit, dessen Verfasser, Theodor Körner, als Freiwilliger unter dem Lützow'schen Korps, am 20 Aug. v. J. bei Gadebusch im Mecklenburgischen, durch eine feindliche Kugel getödtet wurde.

The third and fourth pages have the poem:

Als ein Denkmal jener Tage
Ueberstandner Leidenszeit,
Als ein Sinnbild harter Plage
Ward das eh'rne Kreuz geweiht—
Eines Mannes Brust zu schmücken,
Der mit unerschroknen Blicken,
Und mit eisernem Gemüth
Der Gefahr ins Auge sieht.

Stark und fest, wie dieses Eisen,
Müsse des Soldaten Muth
Sich dereinst im Kampf beweisen,
Ungebeugt von Feindes Wuth!
Wie es in dem Feuer glühet,
Unterm Hammer Funken sprühet,
Biet' er im Gefecht mit Lust
Dem Geschosse seine Brust!

Finster sey des Kriegers Seele,
Wie dies harte Eisenerz!
Und aus seinem Innern stehle
Sich kein Jubel und kein Scherz.
Erst, wenn er den Feind bezwungen,
Und sein Vaterland errungen,
Oefne die verschloss'ne Brust
Sich der neuen Lebenslust!

Ohne Rostflek, ohne Schramme,
Ohne Bruch, wie dieses Erz,
Und geläutert in der Flamme,
Sey auch des Soldaten Herz!
Ohne Furcht und ohne Tadel
Sey er von gediegnem Adel,
Und von allen Schlaken rein
Müsse seine Seele seyn!

Wie mit Schweiss im Angesichte,
Aus der Erde tiefem Schacht,
Zu dem hellen Sonnenlichte
Es der Bergmann einst gebracht:
So will auch der Freiheit Segen
Auf gefahrvoll steilen Wegen
Nur mit Arbeit, Müh und Pein,
Einst zu Tag gefördert seyn.

The publication of the poem, without the author's and publisher's name, town and date on the title-page, would suggest an unauthorised affair in any case. All Körner's works, before and after his death, were very carefully published. But pirated publications of them were by no means infrequent[1], and this might be a case in point. The poem is, however, as in the previous case, entirely unknown to all editions and MSS. of Körner's works, and to the trustees of the Körner-Museum in Dresden. Further, the date of Körner's death, if not a misprint, is incorrectly given as the 20th instead of the 26th in the publisher's paragraph, and it seems probable that Körner's name was appended to the verses to assist the sale.

The matter of *Das eiserne Kreuz*, at first sight, might have been his. There is an earnest and high moral tone throughout, and his early verses on *Bergmannsleben*[2] might have suggested the last verse.

[1] Cf. *Zwölf freie deutsche Gedichte von Theodor Körner*, Leipzig, 1814, 'Vorbericht zur zweiten Auflage.'

[2] *Werke*, p. 42, cf. p. 53 ff.

Nevertheless these likenesses, which might even have been purposely employed by the author, are superficial.

The poems of *Leier und Schwert* are direct lyrics, full of feeling. However influenced by the war-poetry of the period, Körner's earnestness and enthusiasm were his own. But all treating of the same subject, his poems of this period bear a strong likeness to and repeat each other. *Das eiserne Kreuz* does not repeat or bear a likeness to any of them.

Das eiserne Kreuz is a comparison of the iron cross with the soldier's soul. But I have already pointed out that Körner had, in this war, no conception of soldiers. He and his brothers-in-arms were volunteers, a part of 'das Volk.' There were 'Männer' who went out to fight the enemy, and there were 'Buben' (see No. 34) who stayed at home, but no soldiers. Körner uses neither the word 'Soldat' nor 'Krieger' in *Leier und Schwert*[1] (see above). The idea that freedom might be won for his country and the ordinary 'Lebenslust' renewed (v. 3), is quite foreign to Körner, whose war-verses anticipated nothing but death in exchange for the victory of freedom.

The form of the comparison in *Das eiserne Kreuz*, consistently by means of simile as far as v. 4, where metaphor begins to encroach, is not used by Körner. He prefers the symbol. The poem *Die Eichen* (*L. und S.* No. 3) affords in this respect an interesting comparison to *Das eiserne Kreuz*, for in it Körner draws a picture of the contemporary German race in terms of the oak-trees. The second verse shows this particularly well:

> Viel des Edlen hat die Zeit zertrümmert,
> Viel des schönen starb den frühen Tod;
> Durch die reichen Blätterkränze schimmert
> Seinen Abschied dort das Abendroth.
> Doch um das Verhängniss unbekümmert,
> Hat vergebens euch die Zeit bedroht,
> Und es ruft mir aus der Zweige Wehen:
> 'Alles Grosse muss im Tod bestehen!'

Or the *Schwertlied* (No. 36) shows it.

Of rhymes, 'Lust' : 'Brust,' 'Angesicht' : '(Sonnen)licht,' and 'glühet' : 'sprühet,' common to both, are too usual to be a proof. With the case of 'Muth' (: 'Wuth' v. 2, unused by Körner) I have dealt above. The words 'Erz' and 'Scherz' (: 'Herz' vv. 3, 4) are foreign to Körner in any position. He rhymes 'Herz' : 'Schmerz' (of course) *L. und S.* No. 2, 10, etc., and : 'himmelwärts' No. 32, 2 (five times).

MARGARET KÖRNER.

COVENTRY.

[1] He has once 'Soldatentod' (No. 34, 7), but in a different sense.

TWO FRAGMENTS OF ALFRED'S 'OROSIUS.'

THE following two hitherto unnoticed fragments of Alfred's Orosius are contained in the Bodleian MS. Eng. hist. e. 49 and form the sole contents of the manuscript, which consists of two parchment leaves taken from a binding. They are in the handwriting of the early part of the eleventh century. The first fragment corresponds to Sweet's edition of Alfred's Orosius p. 102^{24}—106^{19}, and the second to Sweet p. 120^{14}—124^{1}. I have printed them line for line as in the manuscript, which I have also followed in the punctuation and in the use of capitals. Square brackets indicate that the letters enclosed are illegible or lost in the manuscript and have been supplied, and the sign : means that a letter is gone, but I have not ventured to supply it. Contractions have been expanded and printed in italics.

I.

[Fol. 1]

:::[1] hæfst on þinum bócum sweotole gesæd · 7 Ic gehwam wille
þær[to tæ]can þe hine his lyst ma to witenne. Æ[ft]er þ::san on
ðæm ilcan geare tohlád seo eorðe binnan rome byrig.
ða sædan heora bisceopas eft þ heora godas bædan þ him man
sealde anne cwucne mann þa him þuhte þ hie heora deadra
to lyt hæfdan 7 seo eorðe swa geoniende bád oþ þ marcus þe
o[þ]re naman hatte curtius mid heorse[2] 7 mid wæpnum þær
on innan bescéat · 7 heo syþþan togædere behlad:,
Æfter ðæm þe romeburh getimbred wæs ·ccc· wintru*m*
·7 lxxxuii·[3] þ gallige oferhergodan romana land
æt ·iiii· mila to þære byrig 7 þa burh mihtan eaðe begitan
gif hie þær ne gewicodan forþon þe romane wæran swa forh
te 7 swa æmóde þ hie ne wendan [þ] hie þa burh bewergean mihtan.
ac þæs on morgenne titus heora ladteow þe oþre naman

[1] Room for 2 or 3 letters, now invisible. This first passage corresponds to Sweet 102^{24}—106^{19} and to Bosworth, 55^{41}—57^{16}.

[2] So MS. [3] So MS.

wæs h[at]en[1] quintius hie mid fyrde[2] gesohte þær g[efe]aht[3] mal
lius ánwig[4] þe oþre namam[5] wæs haten tarquatus wiþ anne
gal[li]scne man 7 hine ofsloh 7 titus quintius þa oþre sume[6]
geflymde sume ofsloh · be þæm man mihte ongytan hwæt
ðær ofslegen wæs þa heora fela þusenda gefangen wæs.
Æfter ðæm þe romeburh getimbred wæs ·cccc· win
trum 7 ·ii· þte cartaina þære burge ærendracan
coman[7] to rome 7 him gebudan þ[8] hie frið[9] him betweonum
hæ[f]dan forðon hie on án land winnende wæran þ wæs
on [b]enefente mid þæm þe þa ærendracan to rome coman[10]
þa [c]om eac mid him seo ofermæte heartsælnes 7 mani
gra[11] þeoda yrmþ seo lange æfter ðæm weaxende wæs swa
hi[t] heofenes tunglo on þæm tidum cyþende wæran þ hit wæs

[Fol. 1ᵇ]

niht oþ midne dæg 7 on sumre tíde hit haglode stánum of[er]
ealle romane on þæm dagum wæs alexander geboren on
crecum swa swa án mycel ýst come ofer ealne middangeard
7 ocus persa cyning þone man oþre naman hét artecsersis.
æfter þæm þe he ægypti oferhergode · he gefor on iude
ana land 7 heora feala forhergode. Siþþan on ircaniam
þæm lande he heora feala gesette wiþ þa sæ þe mon caspia
hæt 7 hie þær gesetene synt gýt oþ þysne dæg mid brádum
folcum on ðæm tohopan þ hie god þonon adón to heora ag
num lande · siþþan artecsersis abræc sidonem fenitia burh
seo wæs þa weligost on ðæm dagum · æfter þæm romane ongun
nan þ somniticum gewinn ymbe[12] c[a]mpena land hie þa lange
7 oftrædlice ymb þæt fuhtan on hweorfendum sigum · þa
getugan somnite him on fultum pirrusan epira cyning
þone mæstan feond romanum · þ gewinn wearð hweþre sume
hwile gestilled forðon punici wiþ romane winnan ongunnan.
Seoþþan þ gewinn ongunnen wæs · gif ænig mann sy cwæð orosius
þe on gewritum findan mæge þ ianas dura syþþan belocen
wurde butan anum geare 7 ðæt wæs forðæm þe romane

[1] *haten*] the *at* quite gone, and of the *h* only the top left.
[2] *fyrde*] of the letters *yrd* only portions left.
[3] *gefeaht*] the *efe* gone, and the *g* very faint.
[4] *ánwig*] of the *a* only part left.
[5] So MS.
[6] *sume*] of the *s* only part left.
[7] *coman*] most of the *m* gone.
[8] *þ* very faint.
[9] *frið*] *ið* partly gone.
[10] *coman*] the *o* partly gone.
[11] *manigra*] *ra* partly gone.
[12] *ymbe*] of *mbe* only parts left.

ealne þone gear on manncwealme lagan ær eft octauia
nus dæge þæs caseres · þ hus hæfdan romane to þæm anum
tacne geworht þ on swylce healfe swylce hie þonne winnen
de beon woldan · swa suþ swa norþ swa east swa west · þonne
ondydan hie þa duru þe on þa healfe wæs[1] · þ hie be þæm
wiston hwider hie sceoldan · 7 mid þæm þe hie þara dura
hwylce opene gesawan þonne tugan hie heora hrægl bufa[n]
cneow 7 gyredan hie to wigge · 7 be þæm wistom[2] þ hie wiþ sum
folc friðd næfdan · 7 þonne hie friþ hæfdan þonne wæran
ealle ða dura betynede 7 hie letan heora hrægl on dúne[3] to

II.

[Fol. 2]

[4]eower romana brocu þe ge ðær eallnig drifan[5] næs butan[6]
þry dagas · Philippuses yfel mihte þeah þa gýt be sumum dæ
le gemetlic þincean ær se swelgend to ríce feng alexander
his sunu þeah ic nu his dæda sume hwíle gesugian sceol[d]e þ[7]
ic romana gesecge þe on þæm ilcan tidum gedón wæran:,
Æfter ðæm þe romeburh getimbred wæs ·cccc· wintrum
7 xxvigum · Caudenes furcules seo stow gewearþ swiþe
mære 7 gýt todæge is for romana bysmore þ gewearð æf
ter ðæm gefeohte þe romane 7 somnite hæfdan · swa we ær
beforan sædan þa þara somnita ·xx·m̄· ofslagen wurdan
under fauia þæm consule. Ac somnite æt oþran gefeohte
mid maran fultume 7 mid maran wærscipe to r[o]mana[8]
gemetinge coman þonne hie ær dydan æt þære stowe þe
mon hæt caudenes furculus · 7 þær romane swiþost for
ðæm bescyrede[9] wæran þe him þ land uncuþre wæs þonne
hit somnitum wære 7 on ungewis on anig:::et[10] beforan
þ[11] hie somnite utan beforan þ hie seoðþan oþer sceoldan
oþþe for meteleste heora líf alætan oþþe somnitum on

[1] *healfe wæs*] so MS. Sweet 106[14] and Bosworth 57[11] *healfe open wæs.*
[2] So MS. [3] Sweet and Bosworth *ofdune.*
[4] This second passage corresponds to Sweet 120[14]—124[1] and to Bosworth 62[36]—64[6].
[5] *drifan*] the top part of the *n* is gone, but it was clearly *n* and not ð, as in Sweet and Bosworth.
[6] *butan*] the *n* partly gone. [7] þ] so MS. Sweet *oþ*, Bosw. *oð.*
[8] *romana*] the *o* almost entirely gone and the lower part of the *m.*
[9] So MS. Sweet *besierede.*
[10] *anig:::et*] the 4th letter is clearly *g*, and the one following looks like *r.* Between that and the *et* two or at most three letters are gone. Sweet *an nirewett*, Bosw. *an nyrewett.*
[11] þ] Sw. *oþ*, Bosw. *oð.*

hand gán. On þæm anwalde wæran somnite swa bealde þ se
æþeling þe heora latteow wæs pontius wæs haten · het axian
þone cyning his fæder þe þær æt ham wæs hweþer him leofre
wære þe he hie ealle acwealde þe hie lybbende to bismre
gerenian hete · hie þa se æþeling to þæm[1] bismre getawode
ðe þa on þæm dagum mæst wæs · þ he hie bereafode heora
claþa 7 heora wæpna · 7 cccccc· gisla on his geweald under
fæng on þ rád þ hie heom seoþþan éce þeowas wæran · 7
se æþeling bebead sumum his folce þ hie bebrohtan ro
mana consulas 7 heora witan æt heora agnum lande.

[Fol. 2ᵇ]

:::::::::::::::::::::::::[2] lingas[3] þ heora bysmor[4]
[þe][5] mare wære · geornor we woldan[6] cwæþ orosi[us] eowra[7]
romana bysmra beon forswugigende þonne secgende
þonn[e] we for eowre agenre gnornunge mostan þe ge wiþ þæm
cristendome habbað · hwæt ge witan þ ge gýt todæge wæran som
nitum þeowe gif ge him ne alugan[8] eowre wedd 7 eowre aðas
þe ge him sealdan 7 ge murcniað nu forðanþe maneg[e][9] folc
ðe ge onwald ofer hæfdan · noldan eow gelæstan þ hie eow[10] be
heton · 7 nellað geþencean hu lað eow sylfum wæs to gelæstan-
ne eo[w]re aðas þæm þe ofer eow anwald hæfdan · sona þæs
on þæm æfteran geare forbræcan romane heora aðas
ðe hie somnitum geseald hæfdan · 7 mid papiria heora con
sule hie mid fyrde gesohton 7 þær deadlicne[11] sige geforan
for ðæm þe ægðer[12] þara folca wæs þæs gefeohtes georn som[13]
nite for ðæm onwalde þe hie on ægþere healfe hæfdan · 7 ro
mane for ðæm b[i]smere þe hie ær æt him geforan · oþ roma[14]
ne gefenga[n] somnita[15] cyning[16] 7 heora fæsten abræcan · 7[17]
hie to gafolgildum gedydan · se ilca papirius wæs æfter þæm
gefeohte mid romanum swylces domes beléd þ hie hine

[1] Most of the *to* þæ is gone, a hole having been cut in the parchment.
[2] Space for about 25 to 28 letters.
[3] *lingas*] lower part of *ling* gone.
[4] *bysmor*] only the first stroke of the *r* left.
[5] I think I can make out traces of the *þe*.
[6] *woldan*] the *an* not clear.
[7] *eowra* can just be made out.
[8] *alugan*] very faint.
[9] *manege*] the *g* almost gone, the final *e* quite.
[10] *eow*] of the *eo* only faint traces left.
[11] *deadlicne*] the *d* almost gone.
[12] *ægðer*] the *r* not clear.
[13] *som-*] the first stroke of the *m* gone.
[14] *roma*] the *a* partly hidden by overpasted paper.
[15] *somnita*] portions of the letters gone.
[16] *cyning*] *c* altered from *þ*.
[17] *7*] only a trace left.

to ðæm gecoren hæfdan ꝥ he mid gefeohte mihte þam maran
alexandre wiðstandan gif he eastene of asiam italiam
gesohte swa he gecweden hæfde:,
Æfter þæm þe romeburh[1] getimbred wæs ·cccc· wintrum
7 xxvi · feng alexander to macedonia ríce æfter
philippus his fæder 7 his ærestan þegnscipe on þon gecyþ
de þa he ealle crecas mid his snyttro on his geweald genyd[2]
de ealle þa þe wiþ hine gewinn upp ahofan ꝥ wearð ærest
fram persum þa hie sealdan demostanase þæm philoso:::[3]

A. S. Napier.

Oxford.

[1] *romeburh*] the greater part of *eb* gone.
[2] *genyd*] the *d* clearly there, but hidden by overpasted paper.
[3] *philoso*] the remaining letters illegible.

A BALLAD OF TWELFTH DAY.

THE manuscript B. 14. 39 in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is famous for several things, among others that it contains the poem of *Judas*, the earliest recorded English ballad by two centuries or more. This was published in *Reliquiae Antiquae* and has been reprinted more than once, notably in Child's great collection. It does not appear to have been noticed, however, that the same manuscript contains a poem on *Twelfth Day* of a somewhat similar nature. The more sophisticated metrical form is indeed in rather marked contrast to the plain couplets of *Judas*, but if it is correct to describe the latter as a ballad, I think that the term may also be applied to *Twelfth Day* without manifest absurdity. It may be further removed from the true ballad tradition, but it certainly has the appearance of being founded on it, and I am not sure that a thirteenth-century literary imitation of a popular ballad may not possess even greater interest than the genuine article.

Twelfth Day is written in the same hand as *Judas*. The scribe wrote a very good hand, but unfortunately spelt abominably. The aspirate and spirants caused him particular trouble. On the other hand *y* is carefully distinguished from *þ* by being dotted, and *u* and *n* are kept apart with unusual accuracy. The text is evidently corrupt in places, but it seems doubtful whether the rimes were ever correct throughout.

I have printed the text exactly as it stands in the manuscript, except that I have expanded the contractions, none of which present any difficulty. For *&* I have printed *ant*, since the scribe elsewhere writes *āt*, i.e. *ant*. In a few cases, duly mentioned, the division of words has been altered. I have added a number of short notes which should make the sense clear. The most important of these I owe to the kindness of Professor W. P. Ker.

Wolle ye iheren of twelte day: wou þe present was ibroust·
In to betlem þer iesus lay: þer þre kinges him habbet isoust·
a sterre wiset hem þe wey: suc nas neuer non iwroust·
ne werede he nouþer fou ne grey: þe louerd þat us alle hauet iwroust·

Þre kinges seten in here þede: boþen yonge men ant hore·
ho iseien one sterre scinen: ne seien ho neuer none more·
wel ho wisten wou hit hede: wise men ant witti of lore·
þat iesus was icomen for nede: so hit was iquidded yore·

Þre kinges for ho it herden quidden: þat iesus wolde ben ibore·
þe time com ase ho herdden siggen: a briste sterre ho gunen isen·
ha gunnen bone for to bidden: loc bigunnen to greiþen heo·
mirre·ant stor·gold þet þridde: huc on of hem brouste þe þre·

Foret þe kinges gunnen iwenden: þe sterre bi gon for to springen·
þe on sait gold we sculen him boden: so me scal to riche kinge·
þe stor is god to prestes nede: þe þridde mirre we sculen him bringe·
heo comen in to heroudes þede: ant þer heo herden sotele tidinge·

Þo heroudes herde þe kinges speken: of alle his blisse he was skere·
ful ney is herte wolde to breken: ant þau he madam glade chere·
hendi kinges fer at reken: sechet þat child ant comet eft here·
on him he þoute to ben awreken: if he wiste on londe wer he were·

Þe kinges weren of fer icomen: þet seli child for to sechen·
a present ho heden vnder nomen: wel was hem þat ho it geten·
þer comet an angele atte frome: ant waket hem ase ho gunnen to sclepen·
ant bid hem þene grimme gome: heroudes ant is lond fur leten·

Of þe boru heo gunnen riden: al þoru heroudes rede·
þe sterre was boþen sotel ant sene: in to bedlehem heo hem con lede·
to him þat weldet sonne ant mone: blosmen boþen wite ant rede·
lowe he liste ut of is trone: to sauen us alle quike ant dede·

Þes cnistes weren acnen iseten: ant heret þet child of hende hewe·
þau he lutel were þe yet: for king heo him ful wel icnewe·
þre kinges þe hauet igret: ibrout heo habbet a present newe·
he bit þat heroudes lond fur saket: an angel us saide he nas nout trewe·

Þes kinges were boþe some ant saiste: ant under fongen was here sonde·
a sclepit al þat ilke naiste: ase trewe wid uten niþe and onde·
þer com an angel ant hem awaste: ant dede hem wel to under stonde·
and þene riste wei hem taiste: hammard in to here owene londe·

Þer he godes wille wrouten: þe riste wise king wid uten roust·
heuene king ful hei icorn: iborn was in an asse boes·
her e werede an crowne of þorne: in worlde he ede wit uten scoes·
þent þou mon þat tou ne bee lorn: for alle dedis þat tou doest·

NOTES.

1 The poem begins rather more than half-way down fol. 35 *a*.
wou, how (cf. l. 7).
þe, originally *ye*, dot erased.
ibroust, for *ibrouȝt*, and so *st* for *ȝt* throughout.

2 *þer*, originally *yer*, dot erased.

3 *suc*, such.

4 *fou ne grey*, a regular phrase (like Fr. *vair et gris*); both are furs, *fou* perhaps ermine, *grey* a grey fur usually supposed to be badger. Cf. *Moral Ode*, 391: 'Ne scal þer beo fou ne grei ne cunig ne ermine.'
iwroust, perhaps we should read *iboust*, redeemed.

5 *þede*, country (cf. l. 16).

6 *scinen*, no rime. [Probably we should read *brede*, OE *brédan*, meaning come into existence, appear.—Ed.]
more, greater.

7 *hede*, for *ede*, how it went (K).

9 *quidden*, we should apparently read *quidde* (also *sigge* and *bidde*) for the rime, but *siggen* is anyhow imperfect.
ben ibore, read *ibore be* for the rime (K).

10 *a briste*, written as one word.
isen, read *ise* for the rime.

11 fol. 35 *b*. *loc*=*lake*, gifts. In the TCC Homilies (EETS 53, p. 45) we have 'þe þre loc' in the same connection.

12 *stor*, incense.
huc, for *uch* (cf. l. 3 *suc*), each (K).

13 *Foret*, probably for *forwith*, before: so *Judas*, l. 18: 'Foret hym com þe riche ieu þat heiste pilatus' (K). [*Foret*=forth, *hym* in *Judas* being reflexive: cf. 'In hym com,' a few lines below in the same piece.—Ed.]
iwenden, we should perhaps read *iwende*, but the rime would nevertheless be bad.
springen, read *springe* for the rime.

14 *boden*, read *bede*, offer (K). [Or possibly *sende* in the sense of offer, cf. l. 33. The inner rime would then be in couplets, cf. l. 26.—Ed.]

16 *sotele*, open, clear (cf. l. 26).
17 *skere*, devoid.
18 *is*, his.
madam, for *made ham*.
19 *hendi...here*, addressed to the kings by Herod.
reken (for *wreken*, OE *wrecen*, from *wrecan*) with the sense of driven; possibly from Norse *reka* (=OE *wrecan*), to drive: *fer at reken*, sped from far (K).
20 *were*, part of the final *e* (and the point, if there) concealed in the binding.
21 *icomen*, read *icome* for the rime (and so also *nome* for *nomen*).
sechen (and again *sclepen*) is a mere assonance.
22 *a present*, written as one word.
vnder nomen (read *nome*), undertaken (the giving of a present). [Rather, 'taken to themselves.'—Ed.]
23 *frome*, beginning.
sclepen, the word is partly hidden in the binding: part of *c* and only the extreme top of *l* are visible, *e* has disappeared, *pen* are turned over into l. 24, but only part of *n* is visible, and the point (if there) is concealed.
24 *fur leten*, forsake.
25 Having got into difficulties in l. 23, the scribe now changes to a smaller hand.
riden, we should perhaps read *ride*, but anyhow it won't rime.
26 *sotel* (OE *sweotol*), manifest.
sene, visible: bad rime. [Probably a substitution for *side*, broad, large. If not, perhaps an error for *schene*, bright.—Ed.]
28 *is*, his.
sauen, originally *sauem*, final minim expunged.
29 *acnen*, for *on cneon*, on their knees (K).
iseten, read *iset* for the rime.
heret, honour.
30 *were þe*, read *werede* (cf. l. 4) (K).
31 *ibrout=ibroust* (l. 1), brought.
a present, written as one word.
32 *he bit þat*, read *heo biddet*, they pray.
heroudes...trewe, in the form of direct address.
fur saket, bad rime.
33 *some and saiste*, accordant and in agreement: the phrase occurs in the *Love Rune* (EETS, 49, p. 97, l. 134): 'Alle heo schule wyþ engles pleye Some and sauhte in heouene lyhte.'
sonde, embassy. [Offering.—Ed.]
34 *a*, for *heo*, they.
nïþe and onde, malice and ill will.
35 *awaste*, read *awaiste*, waked.
36 *taiste*, taught.
hammard, for *ham ward*.
37 *wrouten*, bad rime.
roust, not in NED, but from OE *wrôht*, blame: no rime. [It should probably be *rous*, ON *hrôs*, boasting, vainglory. *Wid uten rous*, without lie, in truth.—Ed.]
38 *boes*, originally written *bos·*, then *s* altered to *e* and an *s* written over the point, no fresh point was added: see NED under *boose*, cow-stall, 'especially the upper part of the stall, where the fodder is placed,' i.e. manger. If one were to emend to *boust* (riming with *roust*) the meaning would be much the same: see NED under *bought*, sheepfold; but *boes* is clearly better.
39 *e werede*, written as one word, *e* for *he*.
40 *þent þou*, read *þenc þou*, do thou bethink.
doest, read *does* for the rime.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

FIFTEENTH CENTURY CAROLS AND OTHER PIECES

THE manuscript of which the contents are here printed, St John's College, Cambridge, S. 54, is a single quire of paper of fourteen leaves, measuring $5\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ in. Originally it probably had sixteen leaves, but now wants the first and last: ff. 13 and 14 are fragments.

The manuscript is of Cent. XV (second half), and has its original parchment wrapper. The second cover is so prolonged as to wrap the manuscript round completely. It would travel comfortably in the pocket or wallet, and looks as if it had been folded into half its size. It seems to have been presented to the College by Thomas Baker. The letter B in a modern hand is on f. 1. There seems to be other indication of provenance.

The book is written apparently in two, if not three, different hands: A, a small neat script, f. 1, ll. 1—3, perhaps the first half of f. 2 a, ff. 3 b—4 b, 7 b—10 a, 12 a—14 (i, 1—4; iii; vii, 1—viii, 39; xii, 5—xv, 18; xix ff.); B, large and irregular, f. 1 from l. 4, ff. 2—3 b, 4 b—7 b, 10 a—11 b; the first three lines of 3 a are more roughly written and may be in a third hand. The transcript is careless and the spelling bad: in parts also the writing is faded and difficult to read. There is no punctuation and none has been attempted here; but some emendations of the text have been made, the manuscript readings being given in the foot-notes. The expansion of contractions is indicated usually by italics, but it has not been thought necessary so to distinguish the cases where 'and' is represented by an abbreviation. In the notes at the end of the text some of the difficulties are dealt with, but others must remain unsolved.

[I]

f. 1 a

y^{e} borys hed haue we in bro$\mathfrak{z}$ht
lok $\mathfrak{z}$e be mery in herte and tho$\mathfrak{z}$ht
q*uod* he y^{t} all y^{s} world*e* has wrowt
saue $\mathfrak{z}$ow and eke me

[II]

Of X and M and oy*ir* too
Of I and E I syng all so

X for cr*ist*y*s* hym selfe was dyth
As clerkys redyn in story ryth
Qwan X and M w^{t} word was lyth
To saue us fro y^{e} fend*ys* [feng]
M be gyn*n*yth a gloryos name
Mary moder w^{t} owtyn fane
Qwan X and M was borne i*n* same
Our*e* goy be gynnyth to spr*e*ng

Of E I wyll syng [yer ȝete]
On crist*ys* cross y^{t} let*re* was sette
f. 1 b qwan X and E to gey*ir* mette
M and E in herte was woo
I begyn*n*yth y^{e} name of Ion
qañ X upon y^{e} rode was done
M and I stod styll alone
And hys postyllys went hy*m* fro

y^{eis} iiij letrys worchippe (?) we all
for cr*i*st was borne in ox stalle
to bryng us fro y^{e} dewlys all
w^{t} hys w.....kles

[III]

f. 2 a Nowell nowell ell ell
I wys yt ys a wu*n*d*er* nowell

Jhe*s*u restyd in a may
xl wek*ys* and a day
y*er* fo*re* I may syng and say
Nowell ell ell

At y^{e} feste of architr*i*clyn
Crist t*ur*nyd wat*yr* in to wyn
And y*er* fo*re* xalle y^{is} song be myn
Nowell ell ell

II, 5 wrod. 6 for y^{e} fend*ys* flyth. 11 ȝ yed. 18 wnet hy*m* for^{o}.
19—22 *These four lines are struck out and not altogether legible.* 21 for.

Ihesu asse y^{u} art hewyn kynge
Grawnt vus alle y^{i} dere blyssynge
hosyll and schrift at owre endynge
Nowell ell ell

[IV]

A A A A
gaude cely domina

Mary myld for loue of y^{e}
Glad and blythe now may we be
I ȝow telle os ȝe may see
Tua quinque gaudia

y^{e} fyrst Ioy y^{t} was sente y^{e}
was qwan gabryelle gret y^{e}
and seyd mary of chastite
Efficieris Grauida

y^{e} second Ioy it was full good
qwan crist of y^{e} toke flesch and blode
w^{t} outyn synne w^{t} myld mode
Enixa est puerpera

f. 2 b y^{e} iij Ioy was of grette myth
qwan crist was on y^{e} rode dyth
dede and beryd for oure ryyth
Surrexit die tersia

y^{e} iiij Ioy was on [holy Thurs]day
qwan crist to hewyn toke y^{e} way
God and man y^{s} is oure say
Ascendit supra scidera

y^{e} v Ioy in y^{e} gan lyth
qwan y^{u} were in hewyn w^{t} him dyth
All holy chyrche y^{u} hast in myth
In tua potencia

III, 13 schirft. IV, 2 gaudet. 8 grabryelle. 13 mede. 18 de. 19 on day. 26 I.

[V]

A dere god qwat I am fayn
for I am madyn now gane

y^{s} endyr day I mete a clerke
and he was wylly in hys werke
he prayd me w^{t} hym to herke
and hys cownsell all for to lene

I trow he cowd of gramery
I xall now a good kyll wy
for qwat I hade sicculy
To warne hys wyll had I no may

qwan he and me browt nuus (?) y^{e} schete
Of all hys wyll I hym lete
Now wyll not my gyrdyll met
a dere god qwat I xall say

f. 3 a I xall sey to man and page
y^{t} I haue bene of pylgrymage
Now wyll I not lete for no rage
w^{t} me a (?) clerk for to pley

[VI]

A A A A
salue caterina

lystyn lordyngys qwatte I xall sey
A grette maruell tell I may
Of a louely medyn tell I may
salue caterina

Of god grace sche was full wys
Sche was qweryd in hyr dewys
Of all dottys y^{t} were so wys

Wundyr marwelys be godys grace
y^{r} is no woman in y^{is} plase
A woman is y^{e} of grace

Thorow y^{e} prayer of sent cataryne
God send us a hows twyl in
y^{t} wordy lady and bryth and schene

V, 3 euery. 8 go^{o}d. 10 no] mo. VI, 2 caterria. 3 lordygnys. 4 maruiell. 6 caterria. 15 schne.

f. 3 b

Y^r^ sche in fyre was done
Sche brent nere here nere hone
Sche stod in hewen anone

[VII]

I may syng and sey I wys
Gre mercy my owne [purse]

In euery plas qwere y^t^ I wende
My purse is my owne frende
y^r^ for gladly may I syng
Gre mercy my own purse

Qwere so euer I goo in lond
My purse is redy at my hond
y^r^ for y^is^ is a redy song
vt supra

Qwere so I walke be y^e^ way
My purse xall help me all vay
y^r^ for may I syng and say
vt supra

If I be out in y^e^ cuntre
And my purse be far fro me
yañ most I on beggyng fle
And far xall go and letyll xall haue

And ȝe wol w^t^ fellechyp won
Tay ȝoure purse in ȝore bosom
yan may I well my song vowyn
[Gre mercy my own purse]

[VIII]

f. 4 a

Lullay lay lay lay
my dere modyr lullay

As I me lay y^is^ endyres nyth
All on my loue lokyng
Me thouth I saw a semyly syth
A mayn cradyll kepyng
lullay

VI, 18 sted. *At the end of this piece is written the line,* 'Qwan crist was borne,' *a false beginning of* IX. VII, 21 yan I may I.

y^e^ modyr wold w^t^ outyn song
A slepe here chyld to bryng
y^e^ chyld hym tho3th sche dyd hym wrong
And bad hys mod*yr* syng
lullay

Syng now mod*yr* seyd y^e^ chyld
Qwat xall of me be fall
here *after* qwan I com of age
so chuld y^o^ mod*e*rys all
lullay

ffor eu*e*ry mod*yr* sekyrly
y^t^ can here cradyll kepe
sche most syng lullay
To bryng here child on slepe

Swete mod*yr* seyd he
Sethyn y^t^ it is so
I pray 3ou y^t^ 3e roke me
And su*m* qwat sey y^r^ to

f. 4 b Swet son seyd sche
Qwer*e* of chyld xuld I syng
Wot I neu*er* mor*e* be y^e^
yan of Angyll gretyng

he grett me gladly on kne
he seyd heyle mary
full of g*r*ace god is v^t^ y^e^
y^u^ xalte ber*e* m*e*rcy

I wond*yr* g*r*etly *in* my thou3th
ffor man knew I non
Mary he seyd drede y^e^ no3th
let god all mythy alone

y^t^ holy gost xall do all y^is^
Yow he be owt of won
And xall haue ... M*a*nys blys
Goddys owne son

VIII, 27 xald. 28 Wost. be se y^e^. 29 A Angyll.

[IX]

Qwan crist was borne in bedlem
y^r^ rose a ster*e* os bryth [os lem]
y^t^ gafe so glorius a glem
ou*yr* dale and downe
Our*e* dale and downe it sprong and sprede
y^t^ made iij kyng*es* to be a drede
In to an unchond lond it hem lede
into a towne
f. 5 a y^er^ were iij kyng*ys* of grete renowne
y^e^ cam to seke herowd y^e^ kyng
and askyd hym of all y^t^ thyng
And speryd aftyr y^e^ chyld so ȝyng
y^t^ xuld be kyng
y^t^ schud be kyng of all Iury
we saw a st*er*e secyrly
y^r^ for we worchyp hy*m* for y^i^
y^t^ chyld so ȝy*ng*
Here gold and homage we hym bry*ng*
Wend ȝe forth all thr*e* in fere
And of y^t^ chyld if ȝe may here
y^t^ ȝe wyll com agen *in* fere
I ȝou beseke
I ȝou beseke y^t^ ȝe me say
Os ȝe com homward agen in ȝor*e* way
y^t^ I my selfe hym wy̆rchyp may
y^t^ chylde so meke
On my bar*e* fete I wold hy*m* seke
y^e^ kyng*ys* no leng*er* y^r^ abode
but forth to bedlem yan y^e^ rode
and y^e^ ster*e* befor*e* hem glode
Vn tyll y^ie^ were
f. 5 b Vntyll y^ie^ were y^r^ ihesu lay
woondyn in a cryb of hey
y^em^ thowt it was a por*e* aray
. . . .
Of p*r*ins of pes y^t^ hast no per*e*

IX, 5 sperde. 7 anuchond (?). lēde. 17 ȝung. 21 cum ȝen he (he *perhaps struck out*). 24 homwrod. 27 wlod. 28 abyde. 29 rōde. 34 y^en^.

Now knele we downe all iij in fere
And offyr to y^{is} derlyng dere
Gold foree and rekyls clere
and myre al so
and myre al so in tokenyng
y^{t} he is ueri man and kyng
Soffarond prins ouyr all thyng
oon and no moo
for holy wryth bere wyttenes al so

An angell warnyd hem in here slepe
y^{t} y^{ei} xuld hem for herowyd kepe
y^{ei} thankyd god w^{t} deuocion depe
and hom y^{ie} wente
and hom y^{ie} wente on here Iornay
quan y^{r} of herowd hard say
he seyd alas and welaway
for I am schente
y^{is} chyld he wyll my kyndam hente

f. 6 a y^{e} rerowd was both wode and wroth
w^{t} mekyll Ire he mad hys othe
y^{t} all y^{e} londe it xulde be loth
y^{t} he was borne
y^{t} he was borne y^{t} xuld be kyng
he dyde to doo a spythfull thyng
to slee chyldyrn both elle and 3yng
in bedlem borne
w^{t} in ij wyntrys y^{r} beforne

y^{e} chyldryn sprongyld an y^{e} sperys
y^{e} moderys wept ful bytyr terys
y^{t} herowd dyd hem gylteles derys
y^{t} fend so felle
y^{t} fend so fell fowle mut hym befalle
y^{t} y^{us} y^{eis} chyldyrn martyryd all
On to marie we gye and calle
to scheld us from y^{e} pyth of helle
y^{re} in blys well

IX, 39 Glod. 46 selpe. 50 Iornoy. 51 y^{ie} of. 52 he] y^{e}.
57 *This line is placed after l.* 59 *in the MS.* 61 3yng] thayng. 63 before.
66 gylte les. 70 marte. 71 schend us ferm.

[X]

f. 6 b Lollay lay lay lay my dere modyr lullay
Lullay my chyld

A chyld ys born e wys
y^{t} all y^{is} word xall blys
hys joy xall neu*er* myse
for Ihesu ys hys name

On y^{e} good ȝowe morne
y^{e} blysfull chyld was borne
to were a crown of thorne
vt sup*ra*

Of a mady*n* so good
he toke both fleche and blod
for us he deyd up on y^{e} rode
vt sup*ra*

Of a medy*n* so trew
he toke both fleche and hewe
for us he deyd on a tre
vt sup*ra*

on y^{e} estern morn all blyth
he ros fro deth to lyue
to make us all blyth
vt sup*ra*

f. 7 a On y^{e} good fryday at non
to y^{e} deth he was done
for us he deyd on tre
vt sup*ra*

[XI]

pray we to oure lady dere for here holy *grace*

Sche saw y^{eis} wome*n* all bedene
both for sorow and for tene
Madys and wyuys and weduys *in* weme
all be y^{ei} fayre in face

X, 19 mon. 20 for. XI, 1 oure] ȝoure. 3 fro.

Women be both good and hend
Clen curteys cumly and kend
Yche a cumpany is wele amende
yf a woman be in a plase

Of a woman com all oure blys
y^r for I loue hem all I wys
qwo so euer seyth on hem amys
be god he gawyd in hys face

Were a man in sore syynge
A woman xall hym out bryng
And w^t a kys lesse hys mornyng
and sette hym in solace

7 b y^{ies} men arne falce fekyll in thoȝth
women be wood y^t trow hem howt
for welle y^{ie} hote and hold it noth
but spek in here song

dere lady to y^i son y^u pray
he synd y^{eis} women os he wylle may
for false men y^t downe hym tray
y^t y^{em} sene he neuer in face

[XII]

Now ys y^e xij day com
Fadyr and son to gydyr wone
y^e holy gost w^t hem is nowme
in fere
God send us all a gud new ȝer

I xall ȝow syng thoro hys myȝht
Of a chyld y^t is so fayr of syȝht
a mayd hym bare of cristynmes nyȝht
so styll
as ya was hys wyll

f. 8 a iij kyngys y^r cum of galily
y^e cum toward bedlem iude
hym to sek and to se
Be nyȝht
y^t was a semly syȝht

XI, 8 cupany. amede. 16 mornyg. 25 y^{en}. XII, 3 hym.

As yei cu*m* w^{t} y*er* offryng
y^{e} mete w^{t} Erawd y^{t} mody kyng
he hasked he*m* of here cum*myn*ge
y^{t} syd
and y*us* tyll he*m* he sayd

fro qweyr*e* cu*m* ȝe kyng*es* iij
owt of y^{e} est as ȝe may se
to seke hy*m* y^{t} eu*er* xall be
of myȝht
lord p*r*ince kyng and kniȝht

I pr*a*y ȝow lord*ys* all iij
qwa*n* ȝe haue y^{t} chyld se
y^{t} ȝe cu*m* ageyn be me
and telythe
qwere y^{t} fayr chyld dwellyth

kyng herawd we wyll not lete
as y^{u} hast seyd yt xall be sete
we cu*m* ageyn w^{t} owte lete
and tell
qwer y^{t} fayr chyld dwell

f. 8 b qwan he had seyd*e* hys lykyng
Syr herawd y^{t} mody kyng
and forth y^{e} went*e* w^{t} y^{r} offryng
Be nyȝth
ye stere gaue he*m* lyȝht

be y^{e} stere y^{t} schon so bryȝht
y^{e} iij kyng*ys* tok wey ful ryȝht
Be y^{e} hape of y^{t} chyld so bryȝht
Thoro *grace*
to y^{t} holy place

qwa*n* yei^{e} cum to holy place
y^{r} Ihesu and hys mod*er* was
yi^{e} offryd to hy*m* w^{t} grete solace
infer
gold*e* encens *and* myrre

XII, 25 kniȝh.

all y^{ei} wer both blythe and glade
qwan y^{ei} hade her offryng made
as y^{e} holy gost hem bad
and dedyn
worschype god *and* redyn

qwen y^{e} lordyng*ys* wer wente
y^{e} chyld an angell from hevyn sente
to y^{e} kyng*ys* y^{t} mad presente
or day
to tech hem y^{e} waye

f. 9 a my lord warnyth ȝow euery chone
y^{t} non of ȝow be herowde gone
for yf ȝe don ȝe xall be slone
and stroy
and do ȝow mekyll noye

Thoro y^{e} myȝht of god verrey
y^{e} kyng*ys* tokyn anod*yr* away
owt yei cum or yt was day
full ryȝht
home yei cum y^{t} nyȝht

[XIII]

fadyr my wyll yt is
nolo mortem peccatoris

ffadyr I am y^{i}n owyn chylde
and born of mary meke and mylde
fadyr now my wyll yt is
nolo mortem peccatoris

My hert is sore qwan I be thynk
and se mene trespas and in syn synk
for all y^{t} is done amyse
nolo mortem pec*catoris*

y^{u} falce fend w^{t} all y^{i} slente
y wyll no more man kynde be schente
Of hem y^{u} getyst no ryȝht ywys
vt sup*ra*

XII, 51 blytxhe.

Now mak we both ioy and myrtht
In worschyp of cr*i*stys owyn byrtht
y^{s} is godd*ys* owyn word ywys
vt sup*ra*

[XIV]

f. 9 b War y^{t} war y^{t} war y^{t} wele
Wem*en* be as trew as stele

Stel is gud I sey no od*yr*
So mowun wemen be kaymys brod*yr*
ylk on lere schrewdnes at od*yr*
wem*en* be os trew as stele

Stel is gud in eu*er*y knyf*e*
So kun y^{s} women both flyt*e* and stryf*e*
Also yei cu*n* ful wele lye
wem*en* vt sup*ra*

Stele is gud in eu*er*y nedyll
So be y^{s} wemen both falce and fekyll
and os y*er* a...wyn*e* ry3ht brytyll
vt sup*ra*

Stele is both fayr and bry3ht
So be y^{s} women be candyl ly3ht
And som wyll both flyt*e* and fy3ht
vt sup*ra*

Stel is gud in lond and watyr
So cun y^{s} women both de*n* and flatyr
and 3yt for ned to play y^{e} faytur
vt sup*ra*

[XV]

Ay ay be y^{s} day
y wyll mak mery qwyll y may

Qwyll mene haue her bornys full
y^{r} of y thynk my p*arte* to pull
for to...for y^{e} kyng*ys* wolle
y^{t} may both selye and be my fey

XIV, 13 *partly illegible.*

f. 10 a

for be yt werre or be yt pece
for we may yt be neuer ye lés
lete hem sytte on ye hye dese
To serue hem in hys may

Me thynk ys word is wonder wery
and fadyth as ye brymbyll bery
yr for y wyll now but be mery
how long I xall y can not sey

Syrs and ȝe do after me
Car ȝe not thow yt ȝe the
Now y red do aftyr me
for Iak rekles is my name

[XVI]

Now Ihesus rector anime
ne cademus sustine

God yt all yis word has wroȝth
And wt precius blod hath both
Of us synfull men haue thoute
ne cademus sustine

yu arth lord yt mad all thyng
for all gracè is in yi gouyrnyng
yu saue us fro ye fendys fowndyng
defensor noster domine

We haue iij enmys qwen yt we wende
ye werd ye fendys and ye flesch
yu saue us fro hem yt we not schende
Incidiantes deprime

In all ȝoure leue wyll are here
we haue here wo trauyll and care
mete drynke *and* cloth we haue no more
pro nostro graui opere

XV, 13 būt. XVI, 3 wrod. 8 gouynyg. 9 fre. 13 yu] yt. schede. 16 hire. 17 dryke.

f. 10 b

[XVII]

Nowell
y^is^ word is falce I dare wyll say
and man xall fade as dose hay
for as a flour it fallys away
tunc non ualebit corpore

tell me sothe qwo so canne
qwan he hys dede qwat is he than
qwere se ȝe eny ryche dede man
reuela mihi hodie

y^u^ plesyst hym both nyth and day
and knele to serue hym wyll to pay
he may not hym a good word say
cum operitur puluere

hys secutourys w^t^ oute lete
ȝow be myth...ouer sette
y^ei^ sey he ouyt so mykyll dette
non potest solui integre

qwan he is closyd in hys graue
yan is he y^r^ he may not craue
Os he haue done so xall he haue
oblitus paruo tempore

And y^r^ for man or y^u^ hens wende
dele y^i^ good w^t^ y^i^ honde
And thynke wyll dede man haue no frond
tu miserecis anime

f. 11 a

lord ȝyf us grace so to do here
y^t^ qwan we are broch on bere
y^u^ take oure sole y^t^ y^u^ both dere
pendens alto arbore

and gyfe us grace so to spende
y^t^ god y^t^ y^u^ on to us sende
y^t^ we may sey at oure last end
laus summo regule

XVII, 6 qwat his he wan. 20 praue. 27 y take. 31 ȝoure.

[XVIII]

A newyr a newyr y^{e} chyld was borne
fadyr of hewy*n* hys owyn son haue sende
hys [kyngdom] for to clemy*n*

y^{s} chyld was borne y^{is} end*y*r nyth
v*us* for to saue w^{t} all is myth
so blyssyd be tyme a newyr

y^{e} chyld was borne y^{is} end*ys* day
All of a clene mady*n* as ȝ*ur* tell may
so blyssyd [be] fad*yr* of hewyn t*ur*

All of ane madyn o*ur* lord was borne
All for to wyn y^{t} Adam had forlorn

Lullay my letyll chyld my own swete seynt
[Man]y scharp schour*ys* xall y^{i} body hent

f. 11 b lullay lay letyll chyld my own suete foode
how xall I suffyr y^{i} fayr*e* body forto be re*n*t on rode

lullay lay letyll chyld we owth myrthys to make
for many scharp schour*es* xall y^{i} body schake

lullay lay letyll chyld w*e* out to mak myrth
And so out eu*e*ry cristen man to worchyp y^{i} byrth

blyssyd be y^{e} mod*yr* y^{e} chyld bar*e* about
And so be y^{e} mod*yr* y^{e} chyld gaue soke

blyssyd be y^{e} mod*er* y^{e} chyld cam to
Benedicam*us* d*omi*no
so blyssyd be y^{e} tyme

[XIX]

f. 12 a Nowell nowell ell ell
I pr*ay* ȝow lystyn qwat I ȝow [tell]

Ouer all gatis that I haff gon
Amonge y^{e} grovys so fayer and grene
So ffayer a brownch yan know I non
As Ivy ys and that I mene

XVIII, 9 hewe. 10 mad madyn. 17 schape. XIX, 2 *a word torn away at the end of the line.*

Ivy ys grene and wyl be grene
Qwere so eu*er* a grow in stok or ston
y^er^ ffor*e* I red 3ow so mut I cheue
3e loue well Ivy eu*er*yschon

I xall 3ow tell a reson quy
3e xall low Ivy *and* thynk no chame
y^e^ ffyrst lett*re* begyn*n*yth w^t^ I
and ry3ht 3evyn so Ih*esus* name

y^e^ secund lett*re* ys a V
I lykyn to Awm*i*hty wyffe
Mod*yr* sche ys and maydy*n* trewe
Non but on I y^t^ eu*er* bar*e* lyffe

y^e^ thred lett*re* is an e
I lykyn to emanuell
That is to sey cryst w^t^ v*us* be
And euer mor*e* ffor to dwell

f. 12 b As I lay in my bed alone
A comely lady sent to me
And be bad me rede y^eis^ lettrys eueryschon
and all y^e^ bettre xuld I be

All how holy be 3oure ffonn
And wilde ... towch w^t^ tray and tene
Me...of Yvy xall hym ouer gonne
And ffayer burdys ouer be twene

Ouer all gatys that I have gone
Among y^eis^ grouys ffayer and grene
I have be wery son anon
My botte sche was y^t^ Ivy tre

yus yus Ivy ffull ffay*er* I gan spelle
So ffay*er* a brawnch know I non
I pray 3ow tent qwat I 3ow tell
And love well Ivy eu*er*yschon

XIX, 8 agrow. 14 ry3h. 19 and. 38 eueryschon.

[XX]

f. 13 a

Women ben good ffor lo ...
that sit above
In evyn *yer* sitte a lady ...
Of all wom*en* sche ...
Wom*en* to loue yt y ...
Wom*en* to loue ...
To loue women ...
Wom*en* to loue ...
Wom*en* xall In ...
Day nye nyth ...
Womenys crip ...
I wys I hold ...
That of no w ...
Wom*en* to good
Wom*en* ben goo ...
Wom*en* to us ...
Wom*en* to lo ...

f. 13 b

... I wasche ȝe and goo to met *in* honest
... ȝe xall se
... blyshe ȝ*our* mete
... o ȝe be
... fest be gan*ne*
... e both god and ma*n*
... wasche

vt sup*ra*
... is no nay

vt sup*ra*
... y^{e} blod

... ȝ^{u} good

... ke on me
vt sup*ra*

f. 14 a

qwan ȝe haue was ...
My pasche ...
y^{t} I furssyd ...
loke at y^{e}
to sytte at ...
in hewne ...
so to w ...
y^{t} we m ...
a and ...

NOTES

I This is presumably the last stanza of a piece which was written mainly on the first leaf.

II 5 Perhaps we should read 'Qwan X in to y^{e} word was lyth,' 'When Christ descended into the world.'

6 *feng* (clutches) satisfies the sense and the rhyme. The scribe frequently writes 'for' instead of 'fro.'

IV This piece occurs also (with variations) in MS. Balliol 354 (ed. Dyboski, No. 29) and in Wright's *Songs and Carols* (Percy Society, 1847), No. LIX.

1 The other copies have 'gaude,' which is obviously the true reading.

9 Ball. MS. 'And sayd Hayle Mary *in* chastite.'

19 The other copies have 'on holy Thursday.'

V The text of this piece is so corrupt that it is hopeless to attempt to restore it.

6 *lene*, conceal (='laine'). Perhaps this is the rhyme throughout the stanzas and we ought to read 'mayn,' 'sayn,' 'pleyn.'

18 *me a.* The MS. reading is uncertain here.

VI 8 f. 'She was questioned in her conversation by all the doctors,' &c.

10—15. These two stanzas seem to be in a very bad condition.

VII A different version is given by Wright, *Songs and Carols* (1836), No. IV, and several other pieces occur with the same refrain.

VIII 33 Read 'wondryd.'

38 *Yow*, i.e. Though.

IX 2 *os bryth* [*os lem*], 'as bright as flame.' The line is incomplete in the MS. For 'lem,' cp. MS. Balliol 354 (ed. Dyboski, No. 1, l. 13):

'Forth they went by þe sterres leme
Til they com to mery Bethelem.'

7 *unchond*, perhaps for 'unchende' (='unkende'), i.e. unnatural, strange. Or a misspelling for 'unconde,' unknown.

39 *foree*, probably for 'free,' i.e. abundant.

43 *Soffarond*, i.e. sovereign.

55 Read perhaps 'y^{r} erowd.'

70 Read perhaps 'crye and calle.'

XI 21 *song*] Both rhyme and sense fail here.

XII Also in Wright, *Songs and Carols* (1847), No. XLIII, and elsewhere.

10 Wright, 'As it was hys will.' Perhaps read 'yt' for 'ya' here.

11 Originally 'kyng*ys* of coleyn y^{r} cum,' but 'of coleyn' appears to be struck out, and certainly ought to be so.

19 *y^{t} syd* corresponds to 'That tym' in Wright's text. Apparently 'syd' is for 'syth.' But the version found in MS. Harl. 541 has 'this tyde,' and 'tyd' may be the true reading here.

63 Read 'he xall ȝou slone.' Wright, 'he wol ȝow sclon.'

XIV 8 ff. *y^e^ women*, 'these women,' i.e. women generally.
13 Illegible.
20 *den and flatyr*, perhaps 'scold loudly and flatter'; 'den'=din.
XV 5 f. Not easy either to read or to explain.
XVI, XVII are perhaps one piece, but they are separated by the word 'Nowell' at the beginning of the new page, and the second does not read quite as a continuation of the first. This form of stanza occurs frequently with a Latin tag or refrain.
XVI 9 *fowndyng*, temptation.
XVIII Cp. Wright, *Christmas Carols* (Percy Society, 1841), No. VII.
3 The word 'kyngdom' is supplied from Wright's text. Here a word is torn away.
9 'So blessed be the father of heaven's tower.'
XIX 9 *so mut I cheue*, 'so may I thrive.'
14 Read perhaps, 'And ryȝht begynnyth so.'
16, 20 *I lykyn*, i.e. 'ilike.'
27 ff. This stanza is partly illegible and seems to give no satisfactory meaning, but is apparently a reference to the old strife between ivy and holly.
XX The ends of the lines and the lower part of the leaf are torn away. So on f. 13 b the beginnings of the lines are lost, and again on f. 14 a the ends. On f. 14 b there are a few words only.

M. R. JAMES.
G. C. MACAULAY.

CAMBRIDGE.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Who was John But?

When I attempted to discuss the significance of the addition made by John But to the A-text of *Piers Plowman* (*M. L. R.*, April 1910; see also the reply by Mr R. W. Chambers, *ibid.* July 1911), I was not aware of the interesting fact that a 'king's messenger' of that name is frequently mentioned in the Patent Rolls of Richard II. The first notice of him occurs in 1378, and the latest records his death in 1387.

There seems to be no reason why John But the king's messenger may not have been the same person as the author of the addition to William's poem, who prays for a blessing on King Richard and those lords who are his faithful friends. The identification might perhaps appear unlikely if it were necessary to suppose that the John But who wrote the epilogue to the vision was a professional scribe, but for this supposition there is no sufficient ground. Several other persons named But are mentioned in records of the fourteenth century, but the name does not appear to have been common.

If we could assume (1) that the John But of the Rawlinson MS. is identical with the John But of the Patent Rolls; (2) that he wrote not only the twelve undisputed lines but also the seventeen lines preceding them in the MS.; (3) that when he speaks of William as dead and buried he is stating a fact within his own knowledge; and (4) that the C-revision of *Piers Plowman* cannot have been finished earlier than 1387;—the conclusion would be inevitable that the C-revision is not the work of the original author.

Of course all these assumptions, except perhaps the last, are doubtful. The second and third of them, however, appear to me highly probable. If I could be convinced of the identity of King Richard's messenger with his bedesman who 'meddled of making,' I should feel that the case against the unity of authorship of the three texts was greatly strengthened.

As things stand, however, there seems to be not the slightest reason for inclining either to acceptance or denial of the identification, and it is unlikely that any evidence will ever be discovered that will settle the question. Still, until some negative evidence is forthcoming, the possibility that the verse-maker was the man who died in 1387 ought not to be ignored by students of the Langland problem.

HENRY BRADLEY.

OXFORD.

AUTOGRAPH PLAYS BY ANTHONY MUNDAY.

Lord Mostyn deserves the gratitude of scholars for permitting the reproduction of his interesting manuscript of *John a Kent and John a Cumber*. This has recently been published by Mr J. S. Farmer in excellent collotype facsimile, I presume by Mr Fleming.

The play is signed and dated at the end. Mr Farmer follows Collier, who printed the play for the Shakespeare Society in 1851, in reading the date as December, 1595. The facsimile shows that it is quite certainly '...Decembris 1596.' The signature is difficult to read but seems to be 'Anthony Mundy,' as Collier gives it. The facts that the signature is apparently in a different ink and that it bears no resemblance whatever to the handwriting of the text, suggest that it might have been desirable to offer some evidence for the statement, in which Mr Farmer again follows Collier, that the whole play is autograph. Such evidence is, as a matter of fact, supplied by a manuscript in the British Museum, Add. 33384, which contains, prefixed to Munday's *Heaven of the Mind*, several pages of what are evidently autograph preliminaries, dated 22 Dec. 1602. The hand of these preliminaries is clearly that of the text of *John a Kent*. I am, however, by no means certain that the date at the end of the play is autograph, though it is probably contemporary.

A much more interesting point follows. Mr Farmer writes: 'The first two pages of the manuscript are parchment, in Latin, with ornamental capitals, and the similarity of this leaf to the first four parchment pages of *Sir T. More* suggests that both these manuscripts have passed through the same hands....The similarity of the bold headings in both MSS., *Sir T. More* and *John-a-Kent*, in the parchment pages, forming as it were a kind of title, is suggestive of both being "playhouse copies".' He might have gone further, for the resemblances between the two manuscripts do not end here. They are actually in

the same handwriting, though of course *More* contains extensive additions in a variety of other hands as well.

This fact, that the original draft of *Sir Thomas More* (MS. Harl. 7368) is in the autograph of Anthony Munday, is of some importance. In editing the play for the Malone Society last year I argued that this original draft was in the hand of a scribe. This view was based upon a single small item of evidence, which I then regarded as conclusive, but which turns out to have been misleading. With this, my further suggestion, that what I there term 'B' is the hand of the original author, must be rejected, though this certainly leaves unsolved some curious problems as to the relation of his additions to the original text.

But not only do the three hands seen in the manuscripts of *John a Kent*, *Sir Thomas More*, and the *Heaven of the Mind* offer such resemblances as to place beyond possible doubt the fact of their having been written by one and the same person; they also offer such differences as enable us, I think, to place them in a definite order. Two are dated, *John a Kent*, 1596, and the *Heaven of the Mind*, 1602. But the latter resembles *More* a good deal more closely than it does *John a Kent*, while *More* seems intermediate between the other two. I therefore conclude that *More* must have been originally written between 1596 and 1602, say 1598–1600. This, I confess, agrees with what has always been my personal feeling alike on palaeographical and literary grounds, though I have bowed to weightier opinion and to several small items of indirect evidence in accepting an earlier date. It should be observed that if we are now to revise our notions and place *More* at the very close of the century, we shall have to withdraw the suggestion that resemblances between the additional insurrection scene and certain parts of 2 *Henry VI* point to Shakespeare as the author of the former. Whoever wrote the Jack Cade scenes, it was not the Shakespeare of *Hamlet*, 'argo' if the famous piece of patchwork in *More* was written c. 1600, it was not of Shakespeare's botching.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

Henry Evans and the Blackfriars.

It is hardly necessary to call the attention of readers of *The Modern Language Review* to the extremely interesting documents published from the Loseley House archives by Professor Feuillerat of Rennes in the German Shakespeare Society's *Jahrbuch* for 1912, which solve many doubtful points, and raise about as many more, with regard to the early

dramatic history of the Blackfriars. In particular the newly discovered facts dovetail in with the conclusion to be drawn from the entries of payments by the Treasurer of the Chamber published by me in the *Review* for October, 1906, that during the years 1576—80 Richard Farrant, Master of the children of Windsor, was also acting as deputy to William Hunnis, Master of the children of the Chapel Royal, so far as the dramatic activities of the Chapel were concerned. I may take this opportunity of recording a payment overlooked in preparing my paper, which also serves to supplement Prof. Feuillerat's discovery. He has shown that, after Farrant's death in 1580, the leasehold of the Blackfriars passed to Henry Evans '& frome hym to the Erle of Oxford & from his L. to one Lylye.' We know that Lyly brought Lord Oxford's company, whatever precisely that may have been, to court early in 1584. My overlooked entry shows that, when Lord Oxford's 'boyes' played *Agamemnon and Ulysses* on 27 December of the same year, the payee for their performance was Henry Evans.

E. K. Chambers.

Gerrard's Cross.

Milton in Rome.

In describing Milton's visit to Rome, Mark Pattison writes:—'It was at a concert at the Barberini palace that Milton heard Leonora Baroni sing'; and the same statement is made by other biographers. The musical entertainment given by Cardinal Barberini, of which Milton speaks in his letter to Holstenius, was actually not a concert but an opera, performed in a theatre holding three thousand five hundred persons. The manuscript of this piece was found in the Barberini library by M. Romain Rolland. It is entitled *Chi sofre, speri*, and appears to be a work of considerable length. The performance lasted for five hours, and was embellished with lavish spectacular and choral effects. A special feature was the representation in the second act of the 'Fair of Farfa,' where a multitude of actors appeared representing buyers and sellers, passers-by, and lords in carriages. There were carts drawn by oxen, groups of gay young girls, a charlatan vending his wares, dancing, quarrelling and fighting: opera of the comic kind. Milton's admiration of this brilliant spectacle shows how far he was in 1639 from sharing the spirit of Prynne. See *Histoire de l'Opéra en Europe*, by Romain Rolland, p. 160.

In one of the epigrams to Leonora Baroni, Milton indicates that he heard her sing at a concert where her mother accompanied on the harp. It could not have been at the Barberini entertainment.

J. S. Smart.

Glasgow.

A Herrick Reading.

After Professor Moorman's Note in the last number of this *Review* I think it right to withdraw my previous criticism of the reading 'warty incivility,' which is quoted twice in his volume, *Robert Herrick* (pp. 94 and 133). Prof. Moorman shows that there is authority for the reading in the original edition of the *Hesperides*, and that if 'warty' is interpreted as 'rocky,' it suits the context of the poem *To Dean-bourn*. As 'watry' had become the generally accepted reading, he would have been well advised to add in a footnote the interesting explanation that he has now given of his restored text.

But the curious and important fact remains (as I have found in following up the subject) that 'watry' is not merely a correction, right or wrong, by modern editors, but has even earlier textual warrant than 'warty.' In April and July, 1903, Mr A. W. Pollard contributed two articles to *The Library* (vol. IV, pp. 206–12 and 328–331) entitled *A List of Variations in three Copies of the Original Edition of Herrick's Hesperides*. Here he showed that a copy of the original edition of the *Hesperides* belonging to the Rev. C. P. Phinn contained a number of readings differing from those in the two copies in the British Museum. As a result of his examination of the volumes Mr Pollard concluded that the leaves containing pp. 29, 30, 175, 176, 207, 208 in most copies of the *Hesperides* are cancels. Mr Phinn's copy which, on this showing, represents the earliest printed text, reads on p. 29 'watry incivility.' In discussing this variant Mr Pollard remarks (p. 330), 'on the whole "warty" for "watry" seems a true correction, not merely a printer's blunder, despite the fact that on the other side of the leaf [p. 30] the cancel has two obviously wrong readings.'

A cancel which 'has two obviously wrong readings' cannot claim indisputable authority. Dr Henry Bradley has kindly informed me that in the materials on 'warty' collected for the Oxford Dictionary there is nothing that throws light on Herrick's use of the word. He suggests that Herrick may have been imitating some Latin writer, and calls attention to the definition in Cooper's *Thesaurus* (1565) of

verrucosa loca (wrongly ascribed to Persius) as 'Rough places full of knappes or hillockes.'

In any case Herrick would never have hesitated to use a word in a novel sense. But while 'warty' is exactly suitable to 'knappes or hillockes,' it seems to me much less appropriate to rocks in rushing water. 'Watry incivility' is almost echoed in 'streams...frantick' in the next two lines, and, as support is given to this reading by the Phinn copy, the question of the correct text must, I think, be considered an open one.

F. S. Boas.

London.

Voiture and Steele.

So far as I know, attention has not been called to Steele's indebtedness to Voiture for the subject-matter as well as for many details of the *Spectator*, Nos. 78 and 80 (last portion of each).

The letter of Voiture is the famous one on *car*[1], and is numbered 101 in his Letters (*Oeuvres*, I, p. 293). It is addressed to Mademoiselle de Rambouillet, in reply to one received from her, and is dated 1637 (without month or day).

Steele's letters are dated respectively Wednesday, May 30 and Friday, June 1, 1711. The sub-titles of the portions in question are: *The humble Petition of WHO and WHICH* (No. 78); and *The just Remonstrance of affronted THAT* (No. 80).

The points of resemblance between the letters are evident; the main differences between Voiture and Steele are, aside from the 'galant' attitude of the former, that Voiture writes in his own name, taking up the cudgels for *car*, while Steele makes the words themselves conduct the attack and defence. Steele has also spun out the material into two letters.

Mary Vance Young.

South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.

E. 'grouse,' F. 'greuce.'

'Of unknown origin' in the *N.E.D.*

F. *greuce* occurs, obviously as an article of food, though with no other clue to its precise meaning, in the following enumeration (in a foot-note on p. 19 of the 1st vol. of the *Inventaires mobiliers et*

[1] For the famous 'affaire du car,' cf. F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française*, t. III, p. 385, also p. 102.

extraits des comptes des ducs de Bourgogne...publiés par Bernard Prost, Ministère de l'Instruction publique, 1902):

'I penier d'oitres,' 'I penier de moules,' 'greuces.'

The date is 1329–30.

Does not *greuce* represent the Latin *gruta*, 'gallina silvestris,' in Ducange?

J. DEROCQUIGNY.

LILLE.

E. 'HATCHMENT,' F. 'HACHEMENT.'

Is *hatchment*, as the *N.E.D.* has it, 'shortened and altered from *achievement*'?

Against this statement three arguments suggest themselves:

(1) The earliest form recorded is not *achievement* but *hatchment*.

(2) In the two first quotations s.v. *achievement* the sense of the word cannot, in that dated 1548 apparently, in that dated 1586 surely, come under the definition 'an escutcheon...granted in memory of some achievement.'

(3) If E. *hatchment* does not represent F. *hachement*, how is the non-adoption of F. *hachement* to be accounted for? Can it have been excluded from the wholesale importation of French heraldic terms? This seems a *prima facie* improbability.

F. *hachement* is synonymous with F. *timbre*, E. *timbre*, i.e. 'crest,' as will be shown by the following quotations from Antoine de la Sale, 1459 (in *Traicté de la Forme et Devis comme on faict les Tournois*... mis en ordre par Bernard Prost, Paris, A. Barraud, 1878):

p. 202. 'et sur leurs heaulmes leurs haichemens naturelz, que aucuns disent tymbres'...(in Godefroy).

p. 216. 'Et car nul ne devoit jouster, se il n'avoit son haichement sur son heaume.'—A sentence equivalent to this other one, on p. 217: 'on ne peult jouster, qui n'a son tymbre sur son chief.'

(The word occurs again on pp. 206, 207, 211 and 216.)

F. *hachement, haichement* (see LITTRÉ s.v. *hachement*) is no other than a variant form of *acesmement, acement, achemement* 'parure, ornement,' in Godefroy—not in Cotgrave, who, however, has *achemer, achemmer*, to decke,...attire; *achemes*, attires. It came to designate the 'ornements de tête' worn by knights at tournaments or in the field.

This—for anything that can be inferred from such an unexplicit sentence—may be the meaning in the first illustration in the *N.E.D.*:

1548 Hall, *Chron. Hen. V.* 50: 'The Hachementes wer borne onely by capitaynes.'

Something of this sense still lingers in the quotation dated 1586, s.v. *achievement*: 'The creast, tymber, mantell, or worde, bee no part of the coat-armour; they be addicions called atcheaments.'

Those 'addicions' or *atcheaments*—already an extension of the sense—will easily suggest—since they *achieve*, complete, the armorial bearings—the alteration of *hatchment* or *atchement* into *achievement*, a word with an obvious meaning, whereas *hatchment* conveyed none to an English mind, and the next step will be to bring *achievement* to the stage 'achievement of arms,' which, according to Boutell (*Manual of British Archaeology*, p. 160), is 'a complete heraldic composition... [which] includes, with the shield, its accessories.' To the later restriction of *hatchment* to 'a square or lozenge-shaped tablet exhibiting the armorial bearings of a deceased person' we need not advert.

J. Derocquigny.

Lille.

E. 'junk' or 'rush of the sea,' F. 'jonc marin.'

In reading the *Marvellous Adventures of Sir John Maundeville Kt.* (Constable, 1895), I happen on the following passage:

p. 19. 'there made they the Crown [of Christ] of Jonkes (or Rushes) of the Sea.'

Another similar quotation from the same work is in the *N.E.D.*, as well as this other one, dated 1526: 'Tough sharpe thornes, called the iunkes of y^e^ see'—both under section 1, 'a rush.'

Under *sea-rush*, there is this instance: 1712–13...'Our Saviour himself was to be crown'd with a Crown of Thorns made of y^e^ same sea Rushes.' And the word is explained as 'a species of *Juncus*.'

But

(1) is this plant really 'a rush' or 'a species of *juncus*'?

(2) is not *junk* or *rush of the sea* an awkward adaptation of some French expression in Maundeville's original, the later uses of the phrase being mere unintelligent echoes of this translation?

Adoptions of French words, phrases and idioms are not of rare occurrence in Maundeville. In a cursory reading I have gleaned the following:

p. 18. *Eglantine* (the earliest instance in *N.E.D.*) and *albespyne* (sole instance in *N.E.D.*).

p. 27. *Made sign of,* quoted in *N.E.D.* (1 † b) 'a show or pretence of something' (the earliest quotation), rendering F. 'fist semblance de.'

p. 28. *The* Saturday, in: 'they accurse all those that abstain them to eat Flesh the Saturday,' F. 'le samedy.'

p. 42. *Foss(e)* of Memnon (the earliest instance of *fosse*): F. 'fosse.'

ib. *verres.*

p. 48. Those be *at* his wages: F. 'sunt a sez gages.'

p. 52. *Orient,* adj. (*N.E.D.* gives the French original: 'ccc perles d'orient').

p. 101. *prepuce* (the earliest instance in *N.E.D.*).

Maundeville's *junk* or *rush of the sea* in fact renders F. 'jonc marin,' and elsewhere 'jonc de la mer.'

Now E. Rolland (*Flore populaire,* IV. p. 80) gives *jonc marin* as a synonym of 'genêt épineux,' *Ulex europaeus.* He adds (p. 89) the following piece of information which tallies with Maundeville's description of the crown of thorns: 'Les petits garçons qui font leur première communion, le jour de la cérémonie se rendent à l'église, la tête couronnée de cette plante, en mémoire de Jésus-Christ. Pujet, près Fréjus, Var.'

So, instead of being explained as 'a rush' or 'a species of *juncus,*' *junk* or *rush of the sea,* or *sea-rush* should be defined 'furze, gorse or whin.'

J. Derocquigny.

Lille.

E. 'relent,' A.F. 'relenter.'

The *N.E.D.* does not know the immediate source of E. *relent,* '1. to melt under the influence of heat.'

The word *relenter* occurs in an Anglo-French text of the 13th century, *La Vision de Tondale* (Tnudgal), textes français, anglo-normand et irlandais, p.p. V. H. Friedel et Kuno Meyer, Paris, Champion, 1907:

> Sur ceo feer les almes lez maufez font poser,
> Et en ceo graunt puer les estut arder,
> Et auxi comme la gresez en paeil relenter.
>
> ll. 190—3 (p. 76).

The original Latin, by Marcus, an Irishman, has: 'donec ad modum cremii in sartagine concremati liquescerent.'

J. Derocquigny.

Lille.

'Joncy.'

In Ascham's letter to Raven of 20 Jan. 1551 (*Works*, ed. Giles, I, Part 2, p. 255) he is made to say 'From Colen...we went to Bonna...the country about Rhene here is plain and ioney.' It is not surprising to read the following note on the passage by Dr A. Katterfeld (*Roger Ascham*, p. 124):—'and ioney?—das Wort ist mir unbekannt.' The word should be, I think, 'ioncy' = 'rushy.' Though the *N. E. D.* has no example of the adjective, it shows that 'junk' or 'jonk' (= 'rush') was in use in English before Ascham's time.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Hispanic 'tomar.'

Former *tolle* < *tollit* has become *toglie* in Italian, presumably under the influence of *coglie* < **colliet* < *colligit*. The imperative *togli* has developed the shorter forms *to'* and *toi*: evidently these may be normal, like *a'* and *ai* beside *agli*. By combining *to'* with pronouns, we get *tomi, tomelo, togli, toglielo*. Thus *togli* may be either one word or two; the difference of meaning is slight. In *tomelo* too the dative need not be very important, and might easily be mistaken for a portion of the verb. Such misunderstandings are seen in our depluralized *bodice* = *bodies*, *lettuce* = French *laitues*; in the double "the" of Swedish *det lilla barnet*, French *le lierre*; in the double "with" of Portuguese *comigo*, Spanish *conmigo*, vulgar Italian *con meco*; in the triple "from" of Spanish *de donde*. Even more remarkable is the addition of a verb-ending to pronouns in dialectal Spanish *siéntensen*[1] and Italian *eglino*. A pronoun has been combined with a verb-ending to form German *-st*[2], so that *hast du* corresponds to Latin *capis tu tu*. In Scandinavian the passive verb-ending *-s*, cognate with the Romanic pronoun *se*, is used without distinction of person[3]; an older form of the same suffix has become a portion of the verb-stem in English *bask* and *busk*.

Early Spanish has *tuelle* < *tolle*, and *tuelle* < *tollit*, but *tuelgo* (= Italian *tolgo*) in the first person. The *g* must be due to some external analogy; it may have come directly from *cuelgo*[4] (= Italian *colgo*) < *colligo*. Hence it is possible that *tuelle* once had a variant

[1] Menéndez Pidal, *Gramática histórica española*, Madrid 1905, p. 168.
[2] Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, Halle 1891, p. 222.
[3] Compare the three-personal use of *se* and *svoj* in Slavonic.
[4] Cuervo, *Notas á la Gramática de D. Andrés Bello*, Paris 1898, p. 83.

**toge*, formed in analogy with *coge* < **collie(t)*; much greater alterations are found in *andove* for **andé, estove* for *estide, tove* for **tengue* (?), due to the influence of *ove* < *habui*.

I have shown in *Modern Philology*, VIII, 594, that λ (palatalized *l*) changed through ϱ (palatalized *d*) to *dž* and later *ž* in Spanish. As the older language often lost final *e* where it is now restored by analogy, we may assume, in addition to **toλe* > **toϱe* > **toge*, the variant **toλe* > **toϱe* > **toϱ* > **to*. For the lost occlusive, compare *grande* > *grand* > *gran*. It is also possible that, under the influence of *da-gelo* (= Italian *daglielo*) < *da *li *elo*, Spanish **toge-lo* was taken for **to-gelo* and produced independent **to*. A like development could have occurred in Portuguese, which has normal *tole* and analogic *tolhe*: here the influence of *colhe* is shown plainly by the peculiar participle *tolheito*, parallel with *colheito* representing *collectu* modified by *colhe*. Through misdivision of *tole-o, tolhe-o*, or the earlier forms with *-lo*, the imperative would have become **to*; compare *dá* beside *dá-lh(e)o* < *da *li *elo*. If the foregoing theories of Hispanic **to* seem insufficient, we can construct another: **to* might have been developed from **toge* and *tol(h)e* as an interjectional shortening, like Italian *gua'* for *guarda*[1] and our *kout* < *look out*.

Adding pronouns to Spanish **to*, we have **tome* and **to-melo*, whence by misdivision **tome-lo*. Considered as a simple imperative, **tome* would require an infinitive in *-er* or *-ir*; but the formation of *tomar* is not hard to explain. Isolated **to* could not well be inflected. Hence beside this imperative there would have developed a subjunctive **to el señor, *to vuestra merced*, with the meaning of modern *tome usted*. Likewise (*)*tome* would be subjunctive as well as imperative, and when the pronominal origin of the ending was forgotten, the subjunctive *tome* would produce the imperative *toma* and the infinitive *tomar*. In the same way Portuguese could have formed *tomar* from the subjunctive use of *tome-(l)o*.

In Spanish there is an interjection *to*, 'con que se llama al perro, y es como síncopa de la palabra *toma*.' If this etymology, proposed by the unnamed compiler of the Academic *Diccionario*, is correct, it supports one explanation of **to* given above. If not, it is evident that former (*)*to* may be the same as this *to* and its Portuguese equivalent *tó*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

[1] Malagòli, *Ortoepia e ortografia italiana moderna*, Milano 1905, p. 127.

Portuguese Spelling.

The spelling of Portuguese has long been in much the same condition as that of French: the sound of a word could generally be guessed from its written appearance, but the latter could not be deduced from the former. Among the more wide-spread irregularities were those due to the use of Latin-Greek *ch* = *k*, *ph* = *f*, *th* = *t*, *y* = *i*; these are now abolished by the action of the Portuguese government, which has recently appointed a spelling-reform commission and approved of its labours. Another sweeping change is the simplifying of double consonants, aside from the cases where they are required by the pronunciation. Thus the general basis of Portuguese spelling becomes nearly the same as that of Spanish; in some points it is even simpler. Medial *h* is dropped: *desonesto, niilismo, veículo.* It may be suspected that this is a first step towards getting rid of initial *h*, in accordance with the general Italian practice. Likewise the spelling *quilómetro* is more reasonable, from the Hispanic standpoint, than Spanish *kilómetro.* Of course the use of *u* after *q* is a waste of energy; but so long as *qu* is an established symbol for the sound *k*, *kilómetro* is doubly irregular. Perhaps some day it will be discovered that the *u* after *q* is needless and the example of Antoine Thomas will be followed, *qoi q'il an arive.*

A welcome feature of the new spelling is the systematic use of accents. If a word is printed properly, its stress can now be known with as much certainty in Portuguese as in Spanish. The system is of course more complicated than that of Spanish, since there are two distinctive varieties of *a, e, o,* besides the nasal vowels. It also has a slightly different basis; *i* and *u* in hiatus are treated as syllabic vowels, so that *seriam sérios* corresponds to Spanish *serían serios.* Considered historically, this treatment seems reasonable: stressed *-ia* is an ending of every verb in the language, while stressless *-io* is mainly bookish, popular words of the *tíbio*-type being even rarer than in Spanish (Port. *limpo* = Span. *limpio* < *limpidu*). But the marking of final stressed vowels appears less rational; *a, e* and *o* take an accent, likewise *i* and *u* after a vowel but not after a consonant: *saí* < *salit*, *saí* < *salite*, *uni* < *unite.* In Spanish and Italian, for words of more than one syllable, it has long been settled that a final stressed vowel must have a written accent, and the same rule was adopted some years ago by the Rumanian Academy[1]. Would it not be better to do this in Portuguese?

[1] Tiktin, *Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1905, p. 17.

It must not be supposed the new spelling is phonetic; there are still plenty of difficulties for the native of Lisbon. By reason of the southern leveling of *em* and *ãe*, *ou* and *ô*, *ch* and *x*, *ç* and *ss*, *z* and *s* (after a vowel), countless historic forms are as arbitrary as our *right* and *write*. But any fixed spelling will be a relief, after the anarchy that has long prevailed: some persons call their nationality *português*, while others have preferred the spelling *portuguez*, avoiding the use of an accent by adopting an unhistoric *z*, which is also unphonetic in certain regions[1].

Those who are interested in the matter will find the new forms in A. R. Gonçalves Vianna's *Vocabulário ortográfico e remissivo da língua portuguesa* (Lisboa 1912). This work contains, besides the word-list, an excellent account of Portuguese spelling, and an explanation of verb-forms, regular and irregular.

Edwin H. Tuttle.

New Haven, Conn.

Italian 'x.'

In theory *x* is practically an unknown letter in modern Italian. It is however considered normal by Malagòli in the international prefix *ex-*[2]; and it is used, as in other languages, to evade the statement of a name. In this latter case, and as a mathematic symbol, it is read *is* (or *ics*), according to Petròcchi[3]. As a member of the alphabet, it is named *iccasse* or *iccase*.

I do not know whether Goldoni's dialect plays are fashionable literature nowadays; but readers of modern authors cannot help noticing the Venetian characters in Fogazzaro's writings. One of Fogazzaro's plays is almost entirely in the Venetian dialect[4]. A very common word is *xe* (< *hic est*), meaning 'is.' How is the *x* sounded? I am not aware that any "practical" grammar answers this question, which is nevertheless a practical matter. It has the sound of English *z* or French *z*, which cannot be expressed initially, before a vowel, in Tuscan spelling. This Venetian *x* seems to be the source of Albanian *x* with the same value, according to one of the systems used in the schools[5].

In the Genoese dialect, *x* is used for a sound like French *j*, and

[1] Vianna, *Exposição da pronuncia normal portuguesa*, Lisboa 1892, p. 47.
[2] *Ortoepia e ortografia italiana*, Milano 1905, p. 24.
[3] *Novo dizionario universale della lingua italiana*, II, Milano 1902, p. 1247.
[4] 'El garofolo rosso' in *Scene*, Milano 1903.
[5] Pekmezi, *Grammatik der albanesischen Sprache*, Wien 1908, p. 11.

in Sardic it seems to mean the same thing. Formerly also in Venetian, *x* was used in this way; from there it passed into temporary use in Hungarian[1] and Kroatian[2].

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

THE DATE OF D'URFÉ'S 'L'ASTRÉE.'

In the text of Vol. VIII (p. 14) of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* and in the chronological tables of Vols. VI and VIII, the date of Part I of *L'Astrée* is given as 1610. This is an old error which appears in histories of French Literature of fourteen or fifteen years ago, e.g. Petit de Julleville, Vol. IV (1897), Brunetière, *Manuel* (1898), Lanson, 5th ed. (1898). It used to be supposed that Part I of *L'Astrée* was first published with Part II in 1610, the earliest known edition being of that date. But a statement in Bassompierre's memoirs that the book, *qui lors était en vogue*, was read to Henri IV in January, 1609 three nights in succession when he was suffering from an attack of the gout led Brunet naturally to suspect the existence of an earlier edition. His conjecture was confirmed in 1869, when the bookseller Tross discovered a copy of an edition of Part I, dated 1607 (the privilege is of August 18 of that year). This copy was acquired by the late Baron James de Rothschild, and is fully described by M. Emile Picot in 1867 in his admirable catalogue of the Rothschild library (II, 197). A second copy has in recent years found its way into the sale-room (O.-C. Reure, *La vie et les œuvres d'Honoré d'Urfé*, 1910). The correct date of the First Part of *L'Astrée* is now given in histories of French literature, and in M. Lanson's *Manuel bibliographique*. But oddly enough the latter work, which is very imperfect and disappointing, gives 1612 instead of 1610 for the Second Part.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

DANTE'S REMARKS ON TRANSLATION IN THE 'CONVIVIO.'

At the conclusion of his exposition of the reasons which decided him to write the commentary on the canzoni of the *Convivio* in Italian and not in Latin, Dante says:—

> Sappia ciascuno, che nulla cosa per legame musaico armonizzata si può della ua loquela in altra trasmutare, senza rompere tutta sua dolcezza e armonia. E

[1] Simonyi, *Die ungarische Sprache*, Strassburg 1907, p. 229; now *zs* instead.
[2] Ballhorn, *Alphabete*, Leipzig 1856, p. 44; now *ž* as in Bohemian.

questa è la ragione per che Omero non si mutò di Greco in Latino, come l' altre scritture che avemo da loro ; e questa è la ragione per che i versi del Psaltero sono senza dolcezza di musica e d' armonia ; chè essi furono trasmutati d' Ebreo in Greco, e di Greco in Latino, e nella prima trasmutazione tutta quella dolcezza venne meno (I, 7, ll. 91—103).

It has not, so far as I am aware, been observed that these remarks were apparently inspired, directly or indirectly, by a passage in St Jerome's *Praefatio* to the second book of the *Chronica* of Eusebius, a work which must certainly have been familiar to Dante, as being one of the chief text-books of chronology current in his day. St Jerome, who translated (and amplified) the work of Eusebius, expresses himself as follows, in his prefatory address to two friends, as to the difficulties of the task of a translator:—

Vetus iste disertorum mos fuit, ut exercendi ingenii causa Graecos libros Latino sermone absolverent, et, quod plus in se difficultatis habet, poemata illustrium virorum, addita metri necessitate, transferrent. Unde et noster Tullius Platonis integros libros ad verbum interpretatus est : et cum Aratum jam Romanum hexametris versibus edidisset, in Xenophontis *Oeconomico* lusit ; in quo opere ita saepe aureum illud flumen eloquentiae quibusdam scabris et turbulentis obicibus retardatur, ut qui interpretata nesciunt, a Cicerone dicta non credant. Difficile est enim alienas lineas insequentem non alicubi excedere : arduum, ut quae in aliena lingua bene dicta sunt, eundem decorem in translatione conservent. Significatum est aliquid unius verbi proprietate ; non habeo meum quo id efferam ; et dum quaero implere sententiam, longo ambitu vix brevis viae spatia consummo. Accedunt hyperbatorum anfractus, dissimilitudines casuum, varietas figurarum : ipsum postremo suum, et, ut ita dicam, vernaculum linguae genus. Si ad verbum interpretor, absurde resonat : si ob necessitatem aliquid in ordine vel in sermone mutavero, ab interpretis videbor officio recessisse.

Itaque, mi Vincenti charissime, et tu Galiene pars animae meae, obsecro, ut quidquid hoc tumultuarii operis est, amicorum, non judicum animo relegatis : praesertim cum et notario, ut scitis, velocissime dictaverim, et difficultatem rei etiam divinorum voluminum instrumenta testentur, quae a LXX interpretibus edita, non eundem saporem in Graeco sermone custodiunt. Quamobrem Aquila, et Symmachus, et Theodotio incitati, diversum pene opus in eodem opere prodiderunt : alio nitente verbum de verbo exprimere, alio sensum potius sequi, tertio non multum a veteribus discrepare....Inde adeo venit, ut sacrae litterae minus comptae, et dure sonantes videantur ; quod isti homines interpretatas eas de Hebraeo nescientes, dum superficiem, non medullam inspiciunt, ante quasi vestem orationis sordidam perhorrescunt, quam pulchrum intrinsecus rerum corpus inveniant. Denique quid Psalterio canorius, quod in morem nostri Flacci, et Graeci Pindari, nunc iambo currit, nunc Alcaico personat, nunc Sapphico tumet, nunc semipede ingreditur ? Quid Deuteronomii et Isaiae cantico pulchrius ? Quid Salomone gravius ? Quid perfectius Job ? Quae omnia hexametris et pentametris versibus, ut Josephus et Origenes scribunt, apud suos composita decurrunt. Haec cum Graece legimus, aliud quiddam sonant, cum Latine, penitus non cohaerent. Quod si cui non videtur linguae gratiam interpretatione mutari, Homerum ad verbum exprimat in Latinum. Plus aliquid dicam, eundem in sua lingua prosae verbis interpretetur, videbit ordinem ridiculum, et poetam eloquentissimum vix loquentem.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

BURNHAM, BUCKS.

DISCUSSIONS.

Lydgate's 'Serpent of Division.'

May I ask space to reply briefly to Professor Atkins' remarks on the date of Lydgate's *Serpent of Division*? The problem is rightly stated by him (in your April number) as consisting in the contradiction between the date given in the last sentence of the version in the Calthorpe MS., 1st Henry VI, and the date in the colophon of the same, 1400. Prof. Atkins' theory of original composition in 1400, and revision in 1422, seems, however, not sufficiently supported by the text.

In the first place, the reliability of the Calthorpe MS. as regards figures is open to suspicion. On p. 62 of my edition, this MS. reads 'twoo' where the others read 'thre.' This is due, no doubt, to the omission by the scribe of a letter 'j' in the number 'iij.' On the same page, where the other MSS. read 'eiȝt,' Calthorpe reads 'eche.' There is, therefore, good ground for the supposition that the date 'mcccc' at the end of the Calthorpe MS. has suffered in transcription the loss of certain letters.

In the second place, Professor Atkins seems prone to attach too much importance to the word 'remembred' in the final line of Calthorpe's text. The other MSS. read, 'I have it put in remembrance,' a reading with precisely the same meaning. The word 'remembred,' as applied to the translation, does not have our modern sense, of 'recollected,' but means only 'made a matter of record.' The phrase is common in Lydgate. In his *Pater Noster* (page 61 of my edition in the Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 107) speaking of the merits of that prayer, he says, 'Foure be remembrid in especiall.' The same meaning occurs in lines 49 and 88 of the same poem, and frequently elsewhere in the volume.

In the third place, the 'modernising' tendency of the Calthorpe MS. to which Professor Atkins refers, I believe to be due, as in other Lydgate MSS., not to a revision by the poet, but to frequency of transcription by scribes of a later generation. This of course is not susceptible of proof, but it is a fact that Lydgate's latest work shows no modernising variations from his earlier work, so far as concerns his speech.

In the fourth place, I did not bring forward the parallel passage from *The Story of Thebes* as a source of *The Serpent*, but as containing the trend of thought shown in the *Serpent*, and therefore likely to be near

it in date. Whether the *Story* or the *Serpent* comes first is immaterial, but the identity of language suggests fairly close dates for both pieces, and it can hardly be a mere coincidence that the one piece of Lydgate's many works containing this close identity of thought can be dated within three years in either way of the *Serpent*.

Finally, in the passage referring to Chaucer, it is inconceivable to me that Lydgate, being so devoted as he was to his master, should within a year of the poet's death have referred to him in such a conventional way as he does, without any reference to his recent death. The absence of such a phrase as 'of late,' and of any reference to the loss sustained by his death, did not perhaps justify me in using the expression 'as of one long dead,' but still they argue that Chaucer's death was at some remove from the date of Lydgate's reference, greater than a twelvemonth.

It seems, then, all things considered, that the chance of error in the number quoted by the scribe in the Calthorpe colophon is sufficient to allow of the original production, as easily as the revision which Professor Atkins suggests, in 1422.

H. N. MacCracken.

London.

English and French Metric.

I will not attempt to reply to all Mr Verrier's reflections on my integrity and competence as a metricist. It is not worth while. A reference to Mr Verrier's note on Professor Saran *re* L. Reinach will enable the reader to form his own opinion of the value of Mr Verrier's animadversions.

Mr Verrier complains of my suggestion that he 'insists on confusing' rising and falling rhythm. His reply affords ample justification of my criticism. The lines analysed (p. 526) are divided by Mr Verrier into their phonetic, *not* their metric constituents, and Mr Verrier is correct in supposing that I shall object that 'metrics and phonetics do not necessarily divide speech into the same groups or in the same way.' Why, even Mr Verrier divides metrically from crest to crest, and here, to suit his polemic, he divides into phonetic groups, and so, even on his own showing, proves nothing. I willingly admit that the six lines classed as rising by Mr Verrier *are* phonetically rising, and the four classed as falling phonetically falling[1]. But that has nothing to do, intrinsically, with their metrical classification. When Mr Verrier retorts, as he does retort and will no doubt again retort, that 'Phonetics

[1] It may, of course, be argued that, on a proper reading, the phonetic constituents would agree more closely with the metric. By a proper reading is meant the reading which renders the full *logos* and *ethos* intended by the poet. On any other reading the speech-material is not that which was chosen by the poet and adapted to his selected metre.

divides...in accordance with what we hear' and that metrics cannot divide otherwise on pain of being 'but arbitrary dogmatism' he ignores *what is absolutely fundamental in all metrical investigation*, namely that a line of verse is a portion of speech-material, with all its phonetic features (corresponding to its *ethos* as well as its *logos*) *adjusted*, without violence, to a fixed and definite metrical scheme. The two entities, metrical scheme and portion of speech-material adjusted thereto, are distinct, and the chief study of the metricist is the manner of adjustment of the latter to the former, the way in which a suitable portion of phonetic liquid is chosen and poured into metrical bottles.

If Mr Verrier denies this, he denies the essential conception of metrical science, and it is impossible to argue with him, any more than it would be possible to argue with a physicist who denied the law of causation or with a mathematician who denied that twice two is four.

Again, Mr Verrier leaves the reader to infer from his remarks on my scansion of French verse that I do not know French. 'As this is a question, not of mere scansion, but of pronunciation, we cannot but be right' (p. 528). To begin with, I did not say 'pronounce' but 'scan.' Mr Verrier misrepresents me when he writes: 'The following alexandrine he wants us to *read* (the italics are mine) in this way' (and he then quotes my *scansion*). Even if I had said 'pronounce' Mr Verrier's aspersions would be unjustified. He has only to consult the French phoneticians (Rousselot, Passy, de Souza, Landry) or even a certain letter (12 Jan. 1750) of Voltaire's to La Clairon, to see that it frequently occurs that the 'accent' (I use the word without prejudice, as the lawyers say) shifts from the last syllable of a word to some preceding syllable, or at least that some preceding syllable acquires weight, under the influence of special emphasis (logical or emotional) or of the general rhythmical flow of the accentual group. I will not deny, and nobody can deny, that the alexandrine quoted falls into *phonetic* (or force or accentual) groups as indicated by Mr Verrier, but I am at liberty to *scan* it otherwise. I am even at liberty to read it with an accent on the second syllable of 'éclatantes,' if this word be emphatic. I do not insist that it is. There is nothing to prevent speech-material of the *phonetic* form:

$$\breve{} \breve{} - | \breve{} \breve{} - | \breve{} \breve{} - | \breve{} \breve{} -$$

being adjusted to the metrical scheme

$$\breve{} - | \breve{} - | \breve{} - | \breve{} - | \breve{} - | \breve{} -$$

provided the *French ear* is satisfied with the adjustment and does not lose the iambic rhythm in a series of

cretic, trochee, iamb, cretic, trochee, iamb.

Cretics are frequent in English 'iambic' verse. Many metricists, e.g. Mayor and Professor Saintsbury, accept trochees as well.

To *scan* a French alexandrine as Mr Verrier, Professor Grammont

and the other disciples of Becq de Fouquières scan them is equivalent to scanning Pope's lines (I mark the group-accents)

A máster or a sérvant or a friénd...
Oh máster of the póet, and the sóng...

or (to take more modern examples), Mr Masefield's lines

Of móckery and surrénder and dismáy...
The hót-ache and the skín-cracks and the crámp...

to take only one *phonetic* form of line, as

∪ – ∪ | ∪ ∪ – ∪ | ∪ ∪ –

because, phonetically, at least on a more or less conversational reading, the lines divide in that way! Nobody supposes this to be the *scansion* of an English heroic line. And yet some English Becq de Fouquières (after all Guest was not very different) might write learnedly and unconvincingly on the equivalence of the form

∪ – ∪ | ∪ ∪ – ∪ | ∪ ∪ –

with another very common (phonetic) form of the heroic verse

∪ ∪ ∪ – | ∪ – ∪ | ∪ ∪ –

(A bath of fláme broke roúnd her as she pássed)

or with a third very common form

∪ – | ∪ ∪ ∪ – ∪ | ∪ ∪ –

(I thoúght you'd had enoúgh slops for to-dáy)

and build up a whole scansional system on phonetic divisions that have to do with scansion only as dough has to do with the tins in which the bread is baked. Why Mr Verrier himself scans (I, iv) the line

Le grand feuillage vert autour de moi chantait

iambically. How, on any system whatever, does he propose to assimilate such a line with such a scansion to the, according to him, normal scansion of the alexandrine in four beats? Certainly this line has nothing whatever (on his showing!), save caesura and number of syllables, in common with the line

Le soleil le revêt d'éclatantes couleurs.

Professor Legouis (a Frenchman of complete artistic competence, Mr Verrier will not deny it) comes to my assistance. It is true that (*Défense de la Poésie Française*, pp. 85—86) he postulates 'quatre accents principaux qui lui (the alexandrine) communiquent ... une marche souvent anapestique' and declares that these accents constitute 'le rythme fondamental' of the verse. But in analysing six lines of Boileau,

Le commandeur voulait la scène plus exacte ;
Le vicomte indigné sortait au second acte ;
L'un, défenseur zélé des bigots mis en jeu,
Pour prix de ses bons mots le condamnait au feu ;
L'autre, fougueux marquis, lui déclarant la guerre,
Voulait venger la cour immolée au parterre,

after marking the four 'accents dominants' (mainly group-accents) he admits what I claim, that 'entre les syllabes non marquées, comme portant l'accent rythmique, il subsiste des différences extrêmes, les unes étant fortes et les autres faibles[1].' The distribution of 'fortes' in the lines (p. 85) becomes

3 6 8 10 12
3 6 8 10 12
1 4 6 9 10 12
2 5 6 10 12
1 4 6 10 12
2 4 6 9 12

Now, why should the 'accents dominants' be considered as *metrically* fundamental? No doubt they are *phonetically* fundamental[2]. And Mr Verrier has himself said (*L'Isochronisme dans le Vers français*, p. 6) 'Ce n'est pas que tout accent coïncide avec un temps marqué, ni que tout temps marqué coïncide avec un accent' (in French as well as in German or English). If then we regard the metrical scheme of these lines as iambic, we should scan, keeping Professor Legouis' pronunciation

⏑ ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ –
⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ –
– ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ | – – | ⏑ –
⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ | – – | ⏑ ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ –
– ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ | ⏑ – | ⏑ –
⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ | ⏑ –

The speech-material absolutely fits the metrical-scheme except in fourteen feet out of thirty-six, or bearing in mind the reservation just quoted from Mr Verrier, whereby spondaic and cretic feet are admissible, in five feet out of thirty-six, two of them initial trochees.

Of course all the 'accented' syllables are not equally heavy nor the 'unaccented' equally light. Why should they be? The whole question comes to this: Are only group-accents and one or two very heavy retained word-accents to be regarded as 'metrically valid,' or shall all accents be so regarded, both group, word, secondary, rhythmical and oratorical (or 'shifted')?

Since Professor Legouis admits the existence of an accent on 'plus' in 'plus exacte,' on 'se-' in 'au second acte,' on 'mis' in 'mis en jeu,' on '-seur' in 'défenseur zélé,' on '-lait' in 'voulait venger,' why should not these 'accents' be regarded as capable of exteriorizing the metrical scheme? And if these, why not the still lighter accents, which Professor Legouis does not mark, but which I fancy he would recognize, e.g. on the first syllable of 'défenseur,' etc., and why not the oratorical accents on the first syllable of emphatic dissyllables and the first

[1] The more 'artistic' or 'oratorical' the reading, the more will these secondary differences of weight become prominent.

[2] And in a conversational reading possibly the only ones of importance.

syllable beginning with a consonant of emphatic polysyllables (I am aware that this rule is at best approximative, but I cannot here enter into detail)? Several trochees would disappear from our scansion.

The four-beat scansion favoured by Mr Verrier is prosaic just because it omits all that distinguishes an artistic emotional delivery from a pedestrian conversational reading. The four-beat scansion takes no account, metrically, of most 'accents' other than group-accents and the more important retained word-accents and possibly a casual secondary or rhythmical or oratorical accent when it happens to suit the purpose of the four-beat scansionist. The iambic scansion adds nothing and omits nothing of the full emotional and logical value of the portion of speech material under consideration. With the normal four *phonetic* beats of the classical alexandrine or with the normal three *phonetic* beats of the romantic alexandrine are interwoven, in ever varied pattern and infinite beauty, the six beats of the *metre*. Take away from the alexandrine its sixfold metrical division and you strip it of almost all its possibilities as a complex and wonderfully balanced art-form. Shall we read Pope's line:

Must rise from individual to the whole

as if it were a phrase shot out on the steps of a tramcar, with only the group-accents heavy, and then declare that the scansion is

$$\breve{} - | \breve{} \breve{} \breve{} - | \breve{} \breve{} \breve{} -$$

and that people who scan or read otherwise don't know English?

I do not propose to take up any of the numerous other points of difference between Mr Verrier and myself. As long as we are at variance on first principles it can be of no use to recriminate on one another in reference to minor matters of divergence, however important. On one point and on one point only do I accept Mr Verrier's correction. I should have quoted an English alexandrine not a fourteener (p. 237 and p. 528). But the argument is in no wise affected, since both have iambic scheme with alternating adjustment of speech-material to metre. In conclusion let me say that I regret that Mr Verrier should have supposed that I undervalued the work done by him. I did nothing of the kind. But it seemed better to me to waste no valuable space on merely bandying compliments.

T. B. Rudmose-Brown.

Dublin.

REVIEWS.

The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. WARD and A. R. WALLER. Vol. VII. Cavalier and Puritan. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 8vo. x + 553 pp.

No volume yet published of the *Cambridge History* surpasses the one before us in variety of interest and of matter. The editors, when they first embarked upon their great enterprise, announced their intention of making 'provision for treating certain subjects more or less allied to literature pure or proper,' as, for example, 'the literature of science and philosophy, of politics and economics,' 'the work of schools, universities and libraries,' newspapers, magazines, domestic letters, and so forth—in fact, 'the whole range of letters in its widest acceptation, from "The Cambridge Platonists" to "the fraternity of vagabonds."' In no section of the work is this promise more generously fulfilled than in the present volume, and some of the best and most instructive contributions to it are those which deal with subjects not usually treated in histories of 'literature pure or proper.' There are no better chapters, for example, in the book than that by Mr J. B. Williams on 'The Beginnings of English Journalism,' or Professor Foster Watson's on 'Scholars and Scholarship,' or Dr Ward's on 'Historical and Political Writings'; nor would it be easy to find in any history of philosophy a more lucid and able summary of the work of 'Hobbes and Contemporary Philosophy' than that given here by Professor Sorley. It will thus be seen that the volume contains much that cannot properly be labelled either 'Cavalier' or 'Puritan,' although no better sub-title, perhaps, could have been given to it as a whole.

All the poetry of the period with the exception of Marvell's is dealt with in the first five chapters. Marvell finds a somewhat uneasy place in a chapter mainly devoted to Bunyan. Its author, Dr John Brown, who gives us a sound if not a particularly stimulating appreciation of Bunyan, is indeed 'conscious of making a great transition' in passing from him to Marvell. Marvell deserves, on the whole, a fuller and more sympathetic treatment as a poet than he gets from Dr Brown. One misses, for example, a direct reference to two of his longer poems—*Upon the Hill and Grove at Billborow* and *Upon Appleton House*—which are quite as well worth quoting from, in illustration of his love of nature, as the more familiar lyrics cited here. Marvell's place as a poet is, as

Dr Brown feels, with Herrick and the earlier seventeenth century lyrists, and Herrick is appropriately the poet who leads the way in this volume. No one has a better claim to write of him than Dr Moorman, and this he does clearly and with excellent judgment. As Dr Moorman points out, Herrick is something more, and other, than the mere 'cavalier lyrist' he is so often taken to be; some of his most characteristic songs are such as 'would have found attentive ears among the contemporaries of Marlowe, Breton and Shakespeare,' while others recall 'that which was still more remote from the sophisticated tastes of the cavalier lyrists—the folk-song of the cornfield or the chimney corner.' Herrick's *Noble Numbers* written, as he tells us, by way of reparation for his

> unbaptiséd rhymes
> Writ in my wild unhallow'd times,

do not save him from being, in Dr Moorman's words, 'the most pagan of English poets.' Other singers, much less prodigal of 'wanton' wit than Herrick, felt themselves constrained to tender the same sort of penitential offering to the Heavenly Muse—Habington was one, who 'leaves the theme of earthly love to "the soft silken youths at Court," and is full of self-accusation that he should ever have handled the theme, however purely' (p. 45). These are the men who cause most of the difficulty in attempting to divide the poets of this time into two rigorously defined classes of 'Cavalier' and 'Puritan.' Carew, Suckling and Lovelace are, doubtless, all entitled to parade as out-and-out 'cavalier lyrists,' but how are we to classify poets like Habington or Vaughan? They have affinities with both the sacred and the profane 'wits,' and the title 'The Sacred Poets' which Mr Hutchinson gives to the second chapter in this volume, is applicable in an exclusive sense only to two among the group with which he deals—viz. Herbert and Traherne. Henry Vaughan has left behind him sufficient 'secular' verse to show that he could have held his own, at least, with the best of the courtly wits. But he became, in his own words, 'one of the many converts gained by the holy life and verse' of George Herbert, and it was Herbert's avowed ambition to challenge the profane poets on their own ground. 'Cannot thy Dove,' he asks, 'outstrip their Cupid easily in flight?' Mr Hutchinson writes well and judiciously of Herbert, but he might, in our opinion, have been more generous in his appreciation of the rare poetical qualities of Vaughan. The Silurist, despite what Mr Hutchinson calls his 'defective workmanship,' saw visions and dreamt dreams, in his lonely communings with nature on the Breconshire hills, of a kind that visited no other poet of his time—boasting as he does that he had 'pierc'd through all the store' of Nature, and that he

> broke up some seals which none had touch'd before.

Why Mr Hutchinson should say that 'his chosen name, Silurist, expresses his intimate love of Welsh mountains, etc.' is not quite clear; what the name is, almost certainly, meant to express is the poet's connection with an ancient family of Vaughans who dwelt in south-east

Wales, once occupied by the tribe known as Silures. It is a pity that his brother, Thomas Vaughan, a poet of some potentiality if not of much actual performance, and 'a noted son of the fire and an experimental philosopher' (to quote Anthony à Wood), should receive so perfunctory a notice in this volume. Mr Hutchinson dismisses him in a sentence, and Mr Routh gives him no more than two in his account of the Rosicrucians; but he was, even after his death, of sufficient consequence as a cabalistic writer to come under the lash of Swift in the *Tale of a Tub*. As against this, and other possible slight omissions of the kind, it is pleasant to see Thomas Traherne at last given his due station, both as poet and prose-writer, in a standard history of English literature. In his chapter on 'Writers of the "Couplet"' Mr Hamilton Thompson surveys a fairly familiar field with a clear critical eye, and, among others, those great names of their time, Waller and Cowley, get from him their just dues.

Professor Saintsbury is in one of his own particular preserves in writing of 'The Lesser Caroline Poets,' and, as one might expect, he finds plenty of good sport there, and succeeds in communicating much of his sporting ardour to the reader. It is somewhat of a puzzle, however, to discover the critical purpose of the final paragraph on 'what might have been' in the case of some of these poets; and one wonders the more why it should have been written at all when on the very opposite page—in the opening passages of his chapter on Milton—Professor Saintsbury commends David Masson for having written a biography 'without that undue expatiation into "may-have-beens" and "probablys" and "perhapses" which, despite the temptation to it which exists in some cases, is irritating to the critically minded and dangerously misleading to the uncritical.' Professor Saintsbury himself, in dealing with Milton, makes little, if any, effort to resist this temptation, plentifully studded as his chapter is with conjectures and reservations. Here is one signal example. 'An Aspasia-Hypatia-Lucretia-Griselda, with any naughtiness in the first left out and certain points in Solomon's pattern woman added might have met Milton's views; but this blend has not been commonly quoted in the marriage market.' This expression of opinion, and its form, go to show that the chapter on Milton, whatever else may be said about it, is the liveliest in the book. It bears the marks of all the writer's well-known idiosyncrasies of style and critical judgment. Many things in it are admirably said; other things—well, not so admirably. As a whole, the study of Milton which Professor Saintsbury here gives us is disproportionate. About a third of it is given to biography, and much of that is trivial and unnecessary. Although Professor Saintsbury pronounces 'the Milton legend and controversy' 'tedious and idle like all controversial legends and to be kept down as much as possible,' he himself in this chapter is at some pains to keep it up. Antipathy to Milton's political opinions is even allowed to raise its head here and there, as when we read of 'the peculiar arrogance—the morose determination to be different, the singular want of adaptability in politics and social matters generally which has been

admitted even by sympathisers with his political and religious views.' Poor Mark Pattison 'catches it' once or twice, apparently because of 'his liberalism and his Milton-worship.' Professor Saintsbury is, less irritating when he gives us purely literary criticism, and one can only wish that he had given us more of it in this chapter in preference to discussion of so much 'gossip' (to use his own word) and insignificant personal matters. *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* deserved a more liberal treatment—although much of what is here said of them is finely said. The prose works, again, are somewhat perfunctorily dealt with. Perhaps the best feature of the chapter is the discussion of Milton's versification and style.

The chapters on the prose writers, and on things that scarcely belong to 'literature pure and proper,' are, on the whole, of greater interest and novelty than those on the poets, and form much the more valuable part of the volume, regarded as an embodiment of the results of recent research. It would be presumptuous to attempt a 'review' of them here—nothing more than a brief allusion to each can well be given. Professor Saintsbury writes on four 'Antiquaries'—to wit, Sir Thomas Browne, Fuller, Walton and Urquhart—with all the knowledge, zest and intrepidity begotten of his multitudinous reading, and he is here at his best. Nothing, perhaps, that Dr Ward has contributed to this History is more admirable in presentment—clear, concise and, 'without o'erflowing, full' of rich information—than his double chapter on 'Historical and Political Writings.' Clarendon is inevitably the most imposing figure in his gallery, but the lover of 'mere literature' will, perhaps, derive quite as much pleasure from what he has to say about such typically seventeenth-century people as James Howell and Lucy Hutchinson. One of the best-written and most scholarly chapters in the volume is that on 'Hobbes and Contemporary Philosophy' by Professor Sorley. It may be that the philosophy which he passes under review has but a remote interest for the modern reader, but the literary quality of the writings of Hobbes, at least, still compels our admiration, and Professor Sorley, in a fine paragraph, claims for Hobbes, in common with the other greatest lights of English philosophy, a place 'amongst the masters of language, wherever language is looked upon as conveying a meaning.' Hobbes differs from Bacon, Berkeley and Hume, 'and in his own way is supreme.' 'There is no excess of imagery or allusion, though both are at hand when wanted. There is epigram; but epigram is not multiplied for its own sake. There is satire; but it is always kept in restraint. His work is never embellished with ornament; every ornament is structural and belongs to the building. There is never a word too many, and the right word is always chosen. His materials are of the simplest; and they have been formed into a living whole, guided by a great thought and fired by the passion of a great cause.' Even thus, one is tempted to say, as one thinks of much that this volume contains, should literary criticism be written, if 'language is looked upon as conveying a meaning.' The literary criticism of this

period, by the way, is the theme of an excellent chapter by Professor Spingarn, and it will possibly be news to those who know Rymer only by notorious examples of his 'exaggerated animus against Elizabethan tragedy' to hear that in his *View of Tragedy* 'real learning was placed at the service of criticism, and the first connected account of the rise of modern literatures attempted.' Professor Foster Watson's chapter on 'Scholars and Scholarship' has already been mentioned as one of the most interesting in the book, and it finds a fitting pendant in Mr Bass Mullinger's account of 'The English Grammar Schools.' Mr J. B. Williams deals well with a subject which he has made his own in his crowded little chapter on 'The Beginnings of Journalism,' and the volume is rounded off with a chapter—not perhaps very happily entitled—on 'The Advent of Popular Thought in Modern Literature,' by Professor H. V. Routh. Mr Routh has worked his way through a wilderness of pamphlets on all sorts of odd subjects, and gives us among other things a very full account of the witchcraft controversy, which he regards, 'together with the civil war pamphlets and the puritan tirades, as an inevitable phase in the evolution of English modern thought.' The bibliography and the index are both on the generous scale to which we have been accustomed in previous volumes.

W. Lewis Jones.

Bangor.

Poets and Poetry. By John Bailey. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1911. 8vo. 217 pp.

To write a critical review of essays which are chiefly criticisms of critical editions of poets or critics would suggest an intolerable remoteness from Poets and Poetry. It is Mr Bailey's first distinction that he never fails to lead his reader back to the fountain-head. His criticism becomes not the shadow of a shadow, but a new light by which to see once more the inner meaning of the best things in our literature.

His first essay on the Function of Poetry with its lively insistence on the two sides of the Horatian maxim strikes the keynote of the volume. He notes the modern tendency to give the *prodesse* more than its due, or at least to forget the equal claims of the *delectare*. 'Poets ought surely not to forget that it is their business to win and charm the world: and they need not be quite so scornful as Browning was of the power of tearing an idle man away from his cigar or game of dominoes.' He ends by a fine statement of the organic and spiritual conception of poetry, which Bergson has sown anew in modern thought. He describes the illuminating and enlarging effect of poetry and ends with a sentence worth quoting. 'What comes to us through poetry comes with a higher power of life about it than when it reaches us in any other way. We love more, we hate, we pity, we wonder, we even understand and know more. For the simple truth is that we live more; wherever the breath of poetry passes, it leaves behind it the breath of life.'

The essay on Wordsworth's Creed springs from a criticism of Professor Raleigh's book and in its statement of Wordsworth's mystical faith and vision adds something of value to what is present but not fully developed in the book. We are surprised by an incidental remark that suggests a heresy in so sound a Wordsworthian as Mr Bailey. It is in the essay on Keats, where in insisting that Keats could never have been anything but a poet, he says that Wordsworth might conceivably have been a clergyman. We believe that there was nothing he was more certain not to be. During the four years after taking his degree, when he should have been entering upon a profession, his guardians persistently urged him to take orders, and Wordsworth's reply (not to them) was the remark, 'All professions are attended with great inconveniences, but that of the priesthood with most.' His stubborn independence of spirit and his passion for wandering, born with him and not dying till his death, would sooner have made him a pedlar than a parson.

The essay on Meredith's Poetry, though it sets out to praise and recommend, is disappointing through what we feel to be two important misapprehensions. On the question of Meredith's obscurity he asks, 'Has he ever soothed himself with the deceitful consolation that great utterances are necessarily obscure?' Nothing could be more out of key with the passionate sincerity of Meredith. His poetry is hard to understand partly because thought is hard, partly because so rare a combination of keen intellect and swift imagination leads to a rapidity and richness in expression that ordinary minds are too slow to follow. We admit that his obscurity is a defect, but the defect of so great and unique a quality needs special understanding. In the second place Mr Bailey insists, we think unfairly, that Meredith's message is for the strong not the weak, for the intellect not the emotions. 'He is too strong to help the weak.' His poetic strength lies 'not in heart but in head, not in sympathy but in will.' 'Of mere Earth or mere Brain—the only stuff Meredith would employ—no figure of Love can be wōven.' The best answer to these statements is to be found in the lives of those 'weak' men and women whom Meredith has helped by his strength, and in poems such as *Earth and a Wedded Woman* or *Modern Love* where the deepest and simplest human sympathies are drawn upon, and where the key to tragedy and the hope of life are alike found in a vital conception of the mystery of love.

The essay on Spenser is a fine vindication of the spiritual quality of Spenser's poetry. We wish Mr Bailey had gone a step further and revealed—what is more often ignored—its essentially human quality. Spenser's hold upon the heart of life, his knowledge of men and women, his love of children, his tender insight into human weakness and his impulsive sympathy with human passion guide his portraiture and narrative in the *Faerie Queene* no less than do his taste for romance and his yearning for the ideal.

The essay on Shelley is in part a critique upon Mr Clutton Brock's *Shelley: The Man and the Poet.* Mr Bailey gives ungrudging praise to the book, and declares that the author's statement 'I have written about

Shelley as a middle-aged man for other middle-aged men' is no confession of unfitness for his task. We will admit that at this distance of time it is possible to judge Shelley the man from the middle-aged standpoint. But it is surely impossible now or ever to judge Shelley the poet from it. When we read Shelley's poetry as it should be read, with mind, heart and imagination, the middle-aged point of view has ceased to exist. It is the fault of Mr Clutton Brock's book that, whilst it gives a sane and clear-sighted view of Shelley's life and actions, it fails to do common justice to his poetry.

Mr Bailey writes good criticism on Chaucer and Sidney, Scott and Keats. He is never didactic nor dryly academic, and his style, if it tends to be leisurely in the conversational manner, is always alive and graceful. There is hardly one of his essays that does not freshen and illuminate some treasure of our literature, which time or custom, fashion or chance, has dimmed or cheapened for us.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

OXFORD.

New Poems by James I of England. Edited with Introduction and Notes by ALLAN F. WESTCOTT. New York: The Columbia University Press. (London: Frowde.) 1911. 8vo. xci + 121 pp.

This volume contains fifty-seven poems of James I from a manuscript in the British Museum, acquired in 1841 at the sale of Archbishop Tenison's manuscripts. Twenty-six of the pieces have never been previously published and nine sonnets which appeared anonymously in Vol. XV of the Publications of the Percy Society from a different manuscript now appear for the first time under the name of the author. Of the others eight were included in *Lusus Regius*, edited from an Oxford manuscript by Mr R. S. Rait in 1901; and several were published by the king himself; but the editor claims that even for these the Museum manuscript contains 'the text to which the king gave his final sanction.' For such a decided conclusion as to the king's purpose there is hardly sufficient evidence, but, in any case, it was, for various reasons, clearly the editor's duty to publish the full contents of the manuscript. The notes are thoroughly well done, and the poems are prefaced by instructive dissertations, on the king and his tutors, his study of poetry under Montgomerie, other poets in the Scottish court, his verse and criticism, his patronage of literature in England, and poetry in the English court.

If James lacked poetic afflatus, he was not unskilled in the technique of verse. From an early period he had practised the art under the direction of Alexander Montgomerie who was a specially accomplished metrist; he had also doubtless perused the published and much manuscript verse of the older Scottish poets, and there is further, abundant proof of his wide acquaintanceship with earlier and later French poetry. The poetic tradition in which he was educated was one notable for its clear and terse style, and the special attention it devoted

to form. He shows no trace of the influence of the looser contemporary English school. Most of his verse belongs to his earlier manhood; its language, tone and method is mainly that of the old 'makaris,' though like Montgomerie he had a partiality for the sonnet, of which the earlier 'makaris' knew nothing. With him and Montgomerie the old Scottish school properly ends. He did his best by precept, example and patronage to fan the dying embers of poetry in Scotland; but he could not rekindle them. He had no divine fire of his own, and the kirk, while sufficiently damping, for a time, the sentiments and emotions from which poetry emanates, frowned on every form of verse except that concerned with anti-Popish or 'spiritual and godly' themes.

Apart from its technical accomplishment the verse of James gives evidence of a certain external refinement, largely imitative and derived from a wide familiarity with poetic literature. Occasionally he attains to a pleasing melodiousness or an imposing rhetorical pomp, and happy phrases and turns of expression are not uncommon. Mr Westcott, not unjustly, remarks of two of his sonnets here published that they are worthy of a place 'in even a limited anthology of the sonnets of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century'; and if he rather exaggerates their intrinsic merits, their technical excellence is considerable. But generally the difficulty of James was to keep from dropping down to prosy commonplace or sinking into ludicrous ineptitude. His inspiration was fitful and momentary: it had no sustaining power. Nor could his sense of fitness be long relied on. In addition to the generally commonplace character of its sentiments and its lack of imagination and true emotional warmth, much of his verse is blemished by a fatal tincture of the grotesque.

But if James had but small claims to consideration as a poet, he had a genuine and enlightened interest in the art, and after his accession to the English throne did not a little to further its interests in England. Indeed it may be said that historians, occupied mainly with the ecclesiastical and constitutional squabbles of the period, have too much overlooked the fostering influence exercised by James and succeeding Stewart sovereigns on literature and art. But for them there might for a time have been almost as dreary a blank in English literature as there was, for a considerable period, in the literature of Scotland. As regards James himself it may also be affirmed that his defects and eccentricities are often so magnified as largely to obscure his considerable abilities and his varied accomplishments. In some respects he was an exceptionally clever man; and if the higher qualities of statesmanship be denied him, his pedantry was modified by great practical shrewdness and amazing political dexterity. Mr Westcott is of opinion that he did not conduct his government so skilfully as his arguments, but something must be allowed for the immensity of his difficulties. In any case, while one of the most learned men of his time, he was also a most ingenious and formidable controversialist in ecclesiastical and constitutional disputes, which, if they have now lost much of their importance, were then deemed vital.

Mr Westcott touches, however, but cursorily on the controversial writings of James: he is concerned mainly with his poetic criticism and performances and his relations with the English poets of the period. In discussing his early training he seems rather to overlook the influence of Buchanan in creating his abiding literary enthusiasm. The literary genius of Buchanan might well produce a lasting impression on a precociously intelligent boy such as James. Probably we do not err in tracing to him the vigorous humanist tendencies of James, while his strong theological bent he probably owed largely to the indoctrination of Peter Young, Buchanan's tutorial assistant, who had been a pupil of Calvin. Mr Westcott surmises that 'in the forming of his literary tastes and of his character in general, the older teacher probably did not have so large a share as is commonly supposed'; but he adduces no sufficient reason for this opinion. True from about 1579 the superintendence of Buchanan began, on account of his imperfect health, to be intermittent, but by this time the precocious James was thirteen years of age and quite a marvel of learning and accomplishments. While, however, the literary influence of Buchanan is manifest even in the Scottish poems of James, he did not essay to publish what Latin verse he may have written; and while the poetic repute of several of his royal ancestors may have tended to foster his Scottish poetic proclivities, they received their early nourishment and direction mainly from Alexander Montgomerie.

Mr Westcott goes fully into the question of the relations of James with Montgomerie; and he also chronicles various facts illustrative of the intercourse of James with the English poets of the period and their close connection with the English court. He raises doubts as to the correctness of Ben Jonson's statement that the King expressed the view that 'Sir P. Sidney was no poet.' Henry Leigh reported that James 'commended Sir Philip Sidney for the best and sweetest writer that ever he knew,' a view also largely corroborated by James's epitaph on Sidney here published. Mr Westcott also makes out a fair case for the theory that James exercised a considerable and beneficial influence on the literary tendencies of the period, and adduces plausible evidence 'intended chiefly to support two conclusions: (1) that during James's reign there was a well-defined sentiment at court in favour of a smooth, clear style in poetry (and also in prose); and (2) that the writers who anticipated the manner and matter of late classicism came directly under its influence'; and while not venturing to affirm that 'James himself was responsible for these changes save as an instrument, or as one who adopted and spread abroad the theories he had been trained to accept,' he, at the same time, reminds us that 'his place made his views very influential while his natural gifts were not contemptible.' These seem fairly sound conclusions, though there were stronger and higher influences at work than merely royal precept.

T. F. Henderson.

Bridge of Weir.

Widsith: A Study in Old English Heroic Legend. By R. W. Chambers. Cambridge: University Press. 1912. 8vo. ix + 263 pp.

English, or rather Teutonic Heroic Poetry is at last receiving from English scholars that meed of attention which has long been accorded to it by German and Scandinavian writers, and it augurs well for the future of Old English studies in this country that the Cambridge Press should in the same year issue Mr Chadwick's *Heroic Age*, with its exhaustive study of the Heroic Age of the Teutonic Peoples, as forming part of a still larger theme, and Mr Chambers's scholarly work on *Widsith*.

The store of literature that has accumulated around the heroic themes catalogued in *Widsith* is vast, whether it takes the form of periodical articles or learned monographs or references in works of a more general character. So numerous are the facts, explanations, and theories brought forward in this literature that Mr Chambers rightly says there does not seem to be room for new views on any point, but he has done us the eminent service of bringing those views together, comparing and discussing them, and he has with acute critical judgment, supported by sound scholarship, seen his way again and again to a clear issue through a host of conflicting views. If some of the author's critical *dicta* had been better observed in the past 'much throwing about of brains' would have been saved, not only in the matter of *Widsith* but in that of the whole of Old English literature. 'In investigating the date of the poem, we have no right to reject a passage as interpolated on the sole ground that it does not agree with our view of the date: for to do this is to argue in a circle' (p. 149). 'We only escape from one difficulty into another, if we explain an inconsistent text by assuming an irrational interpolator' (p. 178). Interesting too is the defence of the very definiteness of the theories of critics of the 'dissecting school.' 'It is not sufficiently realised that this definiteness of theory is the only alternative to a vagueness and confused thinking which must ensue, if we argue about interpolations without defining to ourselves their exact scope. It is therefore the duty of a critic who believes a poem or play to be the work of several hands, to form a hard and definite theory, consistent with the facts he has noted. The law of chance is against his theory being right in every detail. But a critic who is quite clear in his own mind as to what he is trying to prove may often prove his general theory, even though we are in doubt as to many of the details. If he confine himself to generalities he will prove nothing' (p. 137).

Before passing to the discussion of details, one other feature of general excellence should be noted, viz., the way in which the author amid the discussion of many difficult and intricate problems preserves the fine flavour of literature. He has many illuminating literary parallels and comments to give us, as for example when he quotes from Racine's preface to *Bajazet* the words:

'On peut dire que le respect que l'on a pour les héros augmente à mesure qu'ils s'éloignent de nous. L'éloignement des pays répare, en quelque sorte, la trop grande proximité des temps, car le peuple ne met guère le différence entre ce qui est, si j'ose ainsi parler, à mille ans de lui, et ce qui en est à mille lieues,'

in his comment on the fine disregard for questions of time and place often shown in early Heroic poetry.

The first three chapters of the book deal with the stories known to Widsith. Perhaps the most important point here is the author's attempt to show that Ealhhild was the wife not of Eadgils but of Eormanric, and that she has taken the place of the Swanhild of the other versions of Eormanric's story. He brings forward some five points in support of his theory but the last, as he himself suggests, is the only one of great and, as it seems to the present writer, convincing weight, viz., that Ealhhild accompanied Widsith to the house of Eormanric. Two explanations have been offered of this journey, one that she went as a hostage, the other as wife. The hostage-theory seems to be impossible for 'if she is the wife of Eadgils, and Widsith escorted her as a hostage to the court of Eormanric, how does she come to be in Eadgils' hall, when he returns home, to present him with an armlet?' We are left to presume that she was Eormanric's wife. That she has replaced Swanhilda and that to her name the poet attached the stories of that princess is more doubtful. The examples of name-change adduced in support of this theory are unconvincing. Such parallels as Hild for Swanhild or Hild(ico) for Grimhild are not parallels at all and such pairs as Hrothgar—Hroar (Hrothhere), Eanmund—Homöthus (Eymothr) are far easier of explanation than the substitution of Ealhhild for a name so completely unlike it as Swanhild. In addition to the Ealhhild identification two other points in these chapters may be mentioned, viz., the strong and convincing appeal made for the identification of the Theodoric who is represented as a hero at Eormanric's court with Theodoric of Verona rather than with Theodoric the Frank, who is out of place there, and the final explosion of the theory that the *citharoedus* whom Clovis the Frank asked as a gift from Theodoric the Great was a Gothic minstrel and that the request is proof of the first spreading of epic poetry from the Goths to the Franks. The minstrel was sent to the Franks to replace barbaric by civilised music and the selection of him was deputed to Boethius the Patrician.

In Chapter V, in various appendices, and in incidental references throughout the book the author deals with the difficult problems of geography and history raised by a study of *Widsith*. This includes a full discussion of the voyage of Ohthere found in the Old English *Orosius*. The present writer, while admitting that he should not in a previous article in this *Review* have 'apologised' for taking the 'Denmark' on Ohthere's left as Southern Sweden, is not sure that the author in his account of that voyage has yet finally removed all difficulties. The form 'Sillende' is against identification with Zealand and it seems unnatural in sailing from Skiringssalr to Hedeby to go right round by the Sound and thread one's way between Zealand and

Laaland and Falster, rather than take the more direct route through the Great Belt, which would be quite consistent with Ohthere's statements. It would be interesting to know if we have any evidence as to the route used by medieval sailors when taking this very common journey. The account of the gradual and peaceful settling of Angel by the Danes is ingenious but not quite convincing. It is doubtful if a historical parallel could be found for such a statement as that 'the remaining Angles would see with satisfaction stalwart Danes coming, not to plunder, but to settle and to take up land in neighbourhoods which had been left naked and defenceless,' and it is certainly contradictory of our general ideas as to the relations of nations with one another at this or any time. This idea of a friendly settlement can hardly be supported by an allusion to the absence of any account of struggles between Angles and Danes in Old English poetry for the connexion between England and the continent seems to have been almost entirely severed immediately after the settlement.

The author does not seem to have definitely made up his mind as to the value of one piece of evidence very commonly used for determining the currency of any particular saga, viz., that of place and personal names. At times, as in the reference to the traitor Bikki in the Eormanric story, he takes the presence of the name Becca in place-names like 'Beccanleah' as evidence for familiarity with that story, while elsewhere he suggests that we must beware of assuming that Englishmen with the name Theodoric were so named after either the Gothic or the Frankish hero. They may have been so named without any thought of a hero at all. This latter view seems the truer one, whether it is a question of a personal name pure and simple or of a place-name derived from a personal name. We must not assume that the names of great heroes were not borne by humble folk before ever they were attached to heroes or even that, when they were used after those heroes were already familiar figures, they were used for that reason. These names may well have been given as we now give a child the name Alfred, not out of reverence for the great king but because of personal preferences or family tradition. A strong case for the influence of heroic legend can only be made out when two or more names from the same story occur together, whether in place-names, as in the well-known 'Beowan-hamm' and 'Grendles-mere' of the Wiltshire charter, or in a genealogy, as in the case of Theodric and Theodhere, the two sons of Ida of Bernicia, corresponding to the brothers Diether and Dietrich von Bern.

In addition to the chapters already mentioned we have others dealing with past critics of *Widsith*, its language and metre, and one embodying the author's conclusions. Finally we have the text of the poem, with full collation of the work of previous editors, commentary and appendices with full discussions of the thorniest problems of the book. Perhaps in the last part of the book there is too great wealth of comment and discussion for the ordinary reader but the lover of heroic legend will feel that it is a case of 'God's plenty.'

The whole volume is printed with extraordinary care, and our

sincerest thanks are due for one of the finest works of Old English scholarship which has been produced in recent years.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

The English Moral Plays. By ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON. (Extract from *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol. XIV). New Haven. 1910. 8vo. iv + 121 pp.

Students of the drama are already indebted to Mr Thompson for a valuable account of the relations between the stage and puritanism. The present study deals with a cognate theme. Mr Thompson sets himself to track the various trends of medieval thought and literary expression, which coalesced in the production of that curious dramatic *genre*, the allegorical morality. It is his primary object to lay more stress than has been laid by his predecessors upon the homiletic factor in the origin of the morality; in fact to suggest the same kind of affiliation between this and the medieval sermon, as has long been established between the miracle-play and the medieval liturgy. It was not, however, quite the same case. The evolution of the miracle-play was a pioneer process, half-unconscious; the morality did not come into existence at all until the miracle-play had already set up a dramaturgic tradition, and the work of its founders was in adaptation, not discovery. But Mr Thompson's well-informed account of *homilaria* and *exempla* and of the use of dialogue by medieval preachers is a useful contribution to the history of the subject. In his later chapters he surveys successively the influence of the themes represented by the *Psychomachia* and *Hamartigenia* of Prudentius, of the Creed and Pater-noster plays, of the *débats*, of the Antichrist legend, of the Dance of Death, and of the Counsel of the Virtues, and indicates the transformation and final disintegration of the morality in contact with the influences of the Reformation and of humanism.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

GERRARD'S CROSS.

A History of French Literature. By C. H. CONRAD WRIGHT. New York: Oxford University Press. 1912. 8vo. xiv + 964 pp.

A common fault of general histories of literature is that they are not definitely planned to meet the needs of a particular class of readers. Their authors waver in their aim between the serious student and the reader who is merely interested, and in their efforts to provide for both fail to satisfy either. Mr Wright's volume is no doubt aimed in the first place at the serious student, but unfortunately he has suffered his vision to be distracted by the intrusion of the general

reader. His own term for this attractive but elusive person is the 'inquisitive foreigner,' and it is doubtless to satisfy this inquisitiveness, which must be much more common in America than in England, that he omits no name that has ever made a figure in literature. A paragraph such as that at the end of the chapter on Rabelais, which sweeps up Des Périers, Bouchet, Du Fail and Béroalde de Verville into a sort of dust-heap, is of no use to the serious student, whatever satisfaction it may give to the 'inquisitive foreigner.' There is a similar dust-heap at the end of the chapter on Racine, but it is when we come to the Nineteenth century that they abound. On p. 681 seven poets are swept up into eleven lines, among them being Mme Desbordes-Valmore who is far more than a 'tearful female sentimentalist,' Barbier and Brizeux. At the close of the chapter on Fiction of the latter part of the Nineteenth century, ten novelists, hardly one of whom need have been mentioned at all, are dismissed in little more than a page. On p. 788 a number of minor dramatists are treated with equal summariness. Mr Wright even crowds his pages with dead names. Surely Louise Colet has no place in literature, and who has heard of Mme Blanchecotte? Occasionally, as on p. 675, names are merely strung together like onions. Finally chapter XVI of Part V is one large dust-heap from which only two men, Renouvier and Brunetière, stand out for particular treatment.

There are other chapters which would be greatly improved by the omission of some names and a fuller treatment and better grouping of others. Such is the omnibus-chapter in Part III, which embraces Men of the World, Scholars, Journalists, and Moralists—a comprehensive heading indeed—and from which possibly Ménage and Cotin, and certainly the *Mazarinades*, Loret, and Cortinelli might have been omitted, so as to allow fuller treatment of La Bruyère and Saint-Simon. Such, too, is the chapter on miscellaneous dramatic forms in Part IV. Here, while the eight immediate successors of Molière might all have been left out, with the possible exception of Baron, a much more illuminating account might have been given of the interesting group, consisting of Dancourt, Dufresny[1], Regnard, and Lesage, which produced comedies during the transitional period between *Les Caractères* (1688) and *Les lettres persanes* (1721). Especially some notice should have been taken of the influence which La Bruyère had on them all. Lesage's *Turcaret* is declared to be 'one of the masterpieces of the century,' but no attempt is made to account for this pre-eminence. There is little fault to find with the treatment of Marivaux, save for the paragraph in which he is coupled (inevitably) with Watteau, for the only essential point of resemblance between the dramatist and the great painter is that in their purity of mind they stand apart from their age. The account of the *comédie larmoyante* and the *drame bourgeois* is satisfactory, but 'crude realism' is hardly the term to apply to that ridiculous melodrama, Lillo's *George Barnwell*, and it is a curious omission to

[1] Dancourt and Dufresny lack Christian names, and no date is given for Dufresny.

speak of Sedaine's *le Philosophe sans le savoir* as the best example—as it certainly is—of the *drame bourgeois* without an attempt to characterise it. The three pages given to the *Théâtre de la Foire* and the comic opera might have been considerably shortened, and more informing than a list of Favart's seven best plays would have been a remark that *Les trois sultanes* is the one by which he is best known, and the only one, I believe, which has been revived in modern times. The chapter ends with the bare mention of Piron's *la Métromanie* and Gresset's *le Méchant*, both of which ought to have found a place earlier in the chapter, between Destouches and Nivelle de la Chaussée. The reader should also have been informed that they were the last comedies of any merit to be written in verse for many a long year. *Le Méchant*, moreover, is very well written and, though it has been overrated, is certainly worth reading. But instead of saying anything about it Mr Wright tells us that Gray admired Gresset's play *Sidnei* (*sic*)[1].

I have made these criticisms, ungracious though they may seem, on a single chapter, not with the object of belittling Mr Wright's knowledge of his subject, which is exceptionally wide and accurate, but in order to suggest the defects which are inherent in a history of literature written on these ambitious lines. Mr Wright recognises that specialisation in every period is impossible for one man, but it is only the specialist, or at least the man who has thought out a topic for himself, who can be of any real help to the serious student.

But there is a way in which the writer of a general history of literature may help the student, and that is by enabling him to understand the development of literature. The student can get his facts and dates from a dictionary or a bibliography, but a continuous history should help him to co-ordinate his facts, to see his authors in their relations to one another and to their social environment. By dividing French literature merely into centuries Mr Wright has missed his opportunity. It is no doubt more or less true, as other writers before Mr Wright have pointed out, that 'in France, the end of the century often seems to coincide with a change in the national spirit, and in the literary tendencies.' But literary tendencies change more frequently than once in a century, rather, once in a generation; and a history of literature which is worthy of the name should take account of these shorter periods of change. In such a history Brébeuf (who, by the way, is known by his hymns rather than by his translation of the *Pharsalia*), Benserade and Segrais, all writers who belong essentially to the period before 1660, would not be sandwiched between La Fontaine and La Fare. As a rule, however, Mr Wright marshals his authors in an orderly sequence, and the chief defect of his arrangement is that it fails to bring out the importance and interest of transitional periods. It is also a mistake to treat the Eighteenth century as a whole, without taking account of the differences between its earlier phase (1721—1750) and that which preceded the Revolution.

[1] Gray also says that *le Méchant* is 'one of the very best Dramas I ever met with' (Gray to Wharton, June 5, 1748).

Mr Wright's introductory and general chapters are among the best in his book, and his claim that 'the relations have been emphasised of literature and social environment,' is thoroughly justified. The chapters on Humanism (II), the Pléiade and its Theories (VI), the New Philosophy and the New Humanism (VIII) in Part II, the earlier chapters in Part III and Part IV, and the two chapters in Part V on the Trend of Thought (IV and V), which are based on M. Faguet's admirable *Politiques et Moralistes du XIX^e^ siècle*, are all excellent. Best perhaps of all is the chapter on the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century (XII), with its well-informed and sagacious handling of Sainte-Beuve, Taine, and Renan. Another good chapter is that on Philosophy and Descartes in Part III. It is clear that Mr Wright is more interested in the history of thought and social forces than in literary form. For instance, in the interesting chapter on Romanticism he dwells more on its social manifestations than on its literary characteristics, and in the chapter on Diderot and the Encyclopædia the part which treats of Diderot's purely literary work—he says strangely that his chief merit rests to-day on his *Salons*—is decidedly inferior to that which deals with the Encyclopædia.

Mr Wright's handling of the chief names of French literature is sane and judicious, but it is neither sympathetic nor illuminating. He is more ready with criticism than with praise, and he does not succeed in bringing out the qualities in each writer which constitute his real claim to greatness. With regard to Molière, for instance, he does not do justice either to his wonderful range of comic power, or to his mastery of dramatic dialogue, or to the admirable construction of his plays—a merit which is too often overlooked—or to his truth to nature, or to the astonishing boldness and prescience of his social satire. 'It was the tragedy of life amid its comedy that he tried to show in his three great plays,' says Mr Wright. Rather he tried to show the comedy of life amid its tragedy. Or, as M. Lemaître puts it, 'if he happens to be tragic, it is in his own despite and from the nature of things.' Mr Wright notes the difficulty that the foreign reader finds in appreciating Racine, and he seems to share this difficulty himself. He is short on Bossuet, and he does not do justice to the complex character of Fénelon. Though he realizes the great influence exercised by Chateaubriand, he does not sufficiently point out his marvellous power of literary presentation, and to say that he is 'one of the worst liars and plagiarists in literature' is crude and misleading. Victor Hugo fares worse, for it is only after six pages of more or less adverse criticism that we are told that 'unfavorable criticism must cease when we consider him as an epic writer.'

The well-informed chapter on Realist and Naturalist fiction begins with a good account of the whole movement, followed by a sound appreciation of Flaubert, and a criticism of the brothers de Goncourt, which is severe but not unjust. Then comes Zola who is refreshingly described as 'one of the dullest writers in French literature.' A due tribute is paid to the artistic impassivity of Maupassant and to the

human pathos of Daudet, while Ferdinand Fabre, a true realist, who is too little read, is rightly commended as 'one of the most noteworthy authors of his generation.' But from this point the chapter, except for a page and more devoted to that curious person, Barbey d'Aurevilly, tails off into a bare list of authors and their works.

With great courage Mr Wright has brought his survey down to the Twentieth century, which he treats in two chapters, entitled respectively, The Tendencies, and The Writers. The latter chapter provides us with a convenient 'Who's Who' of living men of letters. The chapter on The Tendencies, dealing as it does with the Dreyfus case, Pragmatism, Bergson, Modernism, the scientific spirit in history and literary criticism, politics, literature and the drama, offers plenty of scope for controversy. Generally, I should say that Mr Wright's view is far too pessimistic, but I have not nearly sufficient knowledge to criticise it in detail. The attack on *fichomanie* deserves a passing notice. 'The French doctorate dissertations,' says Mr Wright, 'are becoming burdened with undigested and indigestible material.' There is just an element of truth in this, in so far as these dissertations might often be presented in a more thoroughly digested form. But, though one may recognise a danger, one cannot sufficiently admire the industry, the thoroughness, the acuteness, the intelligent sympathy that modern French students of literature bring to their work. Certainly English literature has much to be grateful for in the work of such men as Feuillerat, Legouis, Angellier, and Huchon.

So far as I have noticed, Mr Wright's book is commendably free from slips and positive errors. But the letter of Henri IV on Plutarch, from which he quotes on p. 208, has long been shown to be spurious. De Thou's History was surely never called *Thuana*, which is the name for his Table-talk. The Saturdays of Mdlle de Scudéry can hardly be said to have rivalled the salon of Mme de Rambouillet, for they did not begin till after the Fronde, when Mme de Rambouillet had practically retired from the field. Certain authors call for a rather fuller treatment, as, for instance, Des Périers, Du Bellay, Massillon, Buffon, and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, and I should have liked a more appreciative notice of the conversations in the *Heptaméron* and of the *Satire Ménippée*. Even in Mr Wright's volume you cannot have everything, and I miss, amid so many books which no one wants to read, those memoirs which everyone reads with pleasure. Where are Mme de Caylus, Mme d'Epinay, Mme de Rémusat, and Marbot? Would any one suspect from the bare mention of the memoirs of Louis Racine, Marmontel, and Mme de Staal-Delaunay, what a fund of anecdote and agreeable instruction they contain?

Finally I must give a word of commendation to the Bibliography. Section I, which gives the general bibliography of the subject, will be found especially useful, for it is comprehensive and accurate and shows judgment as well as learning. Section II gives select bibliographies for each chapter; they are well chosen and are up to date, and I have only one general criticism to make, and that is that some indication

might have been given as to the relative importance of the authorities. For instance, the student might be told which of the four most recent works on Balzac were the most important for his life, and which for criticism of his writings. Similarly, with regard to Molière. In the bibliography of Part II, chapter II (Growth of Humanism) I note seven works that are out of date and practically useless: and I miss Mr P. S. Allen's great edition of Erasmus' *Letters*, now in course of publication by the Clarendon Press.

If Mr Wright has come short of complete success, it is because he has attempted an impossible task. It is no longer possible for a single man to write a history of a great literature, such as that of France, that will satisfy the requirements of a serious student. This is not merely because with the growth of knowledge the subject has increased in magnitude, but also because the standard of knowledge has become higher. The real student is no longer content with second-hand information in his teachers. But histories of literature of a less ambitious type are still possible. It is still possible—if you have the gifts of an Andrew Lang—to write a history, instinct with personality, which will at once charm the mature reader and stimulate the young beginner. It is still possible, if you are content to forego all literary laurels, to provide the serious student with a business-like record of facts and authorities. It is even possible to write a history of literature which shall be of service to the student, and not without interest to the mere lover of the subject. But he who attempts this must confine himself to what is significant, he must resolutely discard unimportant names, he must pay close attention to environment and other influences, and he must be content to indicate the merits of great authors rather than attempt any formal criticism of them.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Mr Tilley assures me that, not being a specialist in Old French literature, he cannot undertake to review the medieval section of Mr Wright's book; and I have (however reluctantly) to take his word for it.

Mr Wright, too, assures me, in common with all his readers, that his work does not pretend 'to specialisation in every period—a thing which is impossible for one man now that we are, of necessity, either mediævalists or moderns....The author does not aspire, as some do, to the merit of an absolutely independent judgment on every topic. On the contrary, he considers it the duty of the composer of a synthesis to rely, to a reasonable degree, on those who have spent months or years on individual writers whom he must perforce treat summarily. He sets himself down unhesitatingly as a "pickpurse of another's wit": the authorities from whom he has readily drawn will, it is hoped, be accounted for in the bibliography.'

The bibliography is, indeed, drawn up with great care[1]: the Middle Ages alone fill eight closely-printed pages. With regard to the body of the book, this period occupies 122 pages out of 878—that is to say, four centuries (roughly) are dealt with in a quarter of the work. I do not quarrel with this arrangement; the proportion is the same as in the great history edited by Petit de Julleville.

After carefully reading these 122 pages, it is clear to me that Mr Wright must be ranked among the 'moderns,' and that he has 'readily drawn' from some at least of the authorities quoted in the bibliography. Fortunately he has had sound advisers, and there are few actual blunders: the names of Professors Grandgent and Weeks (in the Preface) are a guarantee for this. But, save perhaps in the chapter dealing with philosophy, I can discover but few traces of first-hand knowledge.

The *genres* are dealt with in separate chapters—which is probably the most satisfactory course to adopt in the case of a literature that is largely anonymous. The origins are briefly treated—three times the scanty details are eked out with references to Voretzsch, though it should be added that a few lines are devoted to the theories of M. Bédier. A particularly unimaginative introductory account of the epic (8 pp.) ends with a dry analysis of three of the poems—the *Roland, Aliscans* and *Huon de Bordeaux* (5 pp.), heralded by the words: 'The French epic may perhaps best be understood by a more detailed study of three of its finest examples.'

Under 'Romance' I find that the tales of Marie de France 'are stories of love among lords and ladies, a love more refined than in the rough passions of the *chansons de geste* or the violent frenzy of the *Tristan* legend.' Quite so. But what is the unfortunate beginner to make of the sentence immediately following: 'They tell of the married woman who loves a knight and tells her lord that she goes to listen to a nightingale; whereupon the cruel husband snares one of these birds and throws the innocent and bleeding thing at his wife, who then sends it to her lover in token that they must no longer meet.' Take the account of the *Tristan* poems of Beroul and Thomas. Surely everyone

[1] Perhaps it would have been better to confine Section I (General Indications) to works of a general kind covering the whole period; as it is, there are necessarily numerous repetitions in the second section, entitled 'systematic bibliography.' As the list does not aim at completeness, no purpose is served by pointing out omissions. Still, Morf's admirable account of Romance literature should certainly have been included. There is a general tendency to neglect works that would make instant appeal—thus, Ker's *Dark Ages* would obviously delight many readers for whom Gröber's monumental work in the *Grundriss* is totally unsuited. Again, there are but few references to English versions of Old French texts. We hope one day to publish a composite review of these translations, the number of which has risen in a striking degree during the last fifteen years. Finally, Mr Wright's observations on the books quoted are not always happy. G. Paris' *Esquisse* is obviously 'a different work from' *La litt. française au moyen âge*; it would have been more useful to point out that the treatment in the one is chronological, in the other according to *genres*, so that the two books supplement each other. Darmesteter's *Historical Grammar* (which should have been quoted in Hartog's English version) is 'a readable study'; and so on. The titles are included of certain books that have been announced to appear—a useful feature.

knows that 'the story is one of the strongest examples of passionate and romantic love in literature.' But it is very difficult indeed for the uninitiated to discover and understand without aid the undoubted beauties of these particular poems; and no aid is forthcoming. Later on we are told that 'another form of the same *motif* [that of *Floire et Blanchefleur*[1]] is one of the masterpieces of medieval literature, the "chante-fable" *Aucassin et Nicolette*, of the twelfth century or in the present form *perhaps* of the thirteenth, in prose interspersed with songs.' Not a word to show why it is a masterpiece. Of the Grail we learn that 'by an accretion of symbolism and idealism it has remained in literature until the days of R. S. Hawker, Tennyson and Wagner.' With all respect for the Cornish poet, we can hardly think that he ought to be brought into this company.

When we come to the lyrics things are not much better. The atmosphere of poems like *Belle Yolans en ses chambres seoit* recalls to our author the pieces of Thomas Haynes Bayly. The *pastourelle* is 'perhaps the most attractive form of all.' Perhaps it is; but is it helpful to be told that the knight woos the shepherdess 'in the strain of: "Where are you going, my pretty maid?"' We are grateful to Mr Wright for including the Goliardic poetry, with a mention of John Addington Symonds' beautiful book. Indeed, it is an excellent feature of the entire medieval section that Latin literature is called in wherever it is required.

The chapter on 'history, biography and chronicles' contains matter that obviously belongs elsewhere—say to the section following, on 'fable literature and short stories' (though in that case 'legends' should perhaps be added to the title)[2]. Thus the legends of the Virgin cannot properly be classed either as history or biography or chronicles[3]. Mr Wright has scarcely caught the spirit of these wonderful little poems: he speaks of 'the rather touching story of the *Tombeor Nostre Dame*' and the man's 'unseemly tricks[4].' The modern parallel in this case is

[1] Mr Wright says that this 'has been called the "Paul and Virginia" of the Middle Ages.' Whoever called it that understood neither of the works. I shall have occasion to quote further parallels, many of which strike me as unhappy. The truth of the matter is that, while it may occasionally be useful to contrast medieval and modern works, very little is gained by comparing them, save in cases of obvious imitation.

[2] I have found the following a convenient classification for Old French narrative literature. (1) National Epic. (2) Epic of Antiquity. (3) Arthurian Epic and Celtic Romance. (4) Narrative literature exclusive of the epic: (*a*) the *Rose* (and allegorical literature); (*b*) the *Renart* (and beast literature); (*c*) religious legends; (*d*) fableaux; (*e*) other tales and romances. The chronicles in verse and prose are perhaps best treated separately or classed under didactic literature.

[3] No one will be satisfied with this arrangement. The British Museum authorities, probably in deference to public opinion, adopted the other extreme, and omitted all these legends from their Catalogue of Romances.

[4] Let him read Tobler's account of this 'Kleine Legende, die man noch heute nicht ohne lächelnde Rührung liest, so schlicht und treuherzig erzählt sie ein unbekannter Dichter einem lateinischen Buche nach' (in *Spielmannsleben im alten Frankreich*, now happily rescued from comparative neglect and reprinted, together with much other valuable matter, in the volume containing the fifth series of *Vermischte Beiträge*, Leipzig, 1912). It is of interest to note that the same *motif* has been handled by two modern masters: by Gottfried Keller in his poem *Der Narr des Grafen von Zimmern*; and by

Massenet's opera *Le Jongleur de Nostre Dame*. It is true that the librettist has done his work with some skill, but surely Anatole France deserved precedence. An able critic might have contrasted the exquisite sincerity of the medieval artist with the no less exquisite (and probably largely unconscious) irony of the great modern writer[1]. Garnier's *S. Thomas* duly appears in this chapter. We learn that the author was 'a wandering scholar and contemporary of Chrétien de Troyes [which does not help us much], who tried to give an impartial yet vivid and dramatic narrative of his hero's life and death.' Scarcely an adequate account of a really great work!

Coming to the short stories Mr Wright asks: 'Have the *fabliaux* any merit at all? The single one of realistic observation, though, let us hope, as much overdone as the realism of the modern naturalistic school.' Surely no 'mediævalist' would ever have written this; and many 'moderns' would hesitate to subscribe to the latter portion of the sentence. Old French literature, like the literature and art of every age and country, has to be studied historically. *Auberee* is a masterpiece no less than the *Celestina*, though both may be 'unpleasant.'

When we reach the Drama, we get what may be called the 'box-office' point of view. 'The great period of the theatre in France does not come until the later Middle Ages: the fifteenth century is the time of its greatest vogue'; or again 'the fifteenth century is the period of the greatest splendour of the French theatre.' The trouble, of course, is that the really 'great period' comes before the fifteenth century. A play is not necessarily good because it runs into thousands of lines or because it is popular. Though Mr Wright gives a fair account of the earlier pieces he does not seem to realise the simple beauty of such things as the *Adam*, or the power and originality of men like Jean Bodel and Adam de la Halle.

A writer dealing with allegory is a pretty safe guide if he is sound on the *Rose*. Though Mr Wright says many things that are undoubtedly true about this extraordinary work, his account lacks enthusiasm and is not likely to win it any fresh readers. 'In spite of the characteristic mediæval redundancy of treatment, the love poem of Guillaume de Lorris contains many an attractive passage'; in the hands of Jean de Meung 'it became a poem of satire of the ideas of his time and a polemical criticism of important topics then under discussion, with violent satire of the clergy and of women.' Bald statements such as these surely need development; a few happily chosen examples, if

Arnold Böcklin in the painting which depicts an aged hermit playing his fiddle before a rude image of the Virgin Mary, while little angels watch him, clapping their hands and laughing for joy.

[1] The Vollmöller-Humperdinck-Reinhardt production of *The Miracle* has familiarised a large public with the legend which, in its original Old French form, is perhaps the most beautiful of them all; the story deserved mention if only for the reason that two modern poets of distinction have revived the theme: John Davidson (*The Ballad of a Nun*) and Maeterlinck (*Sœur Béatrice*). The current number of the *Odd Volume* contains a rendering (the first in English) of the Old French legend by Mr Mason.

nothing else, would serve to carry conviction. The space that might have been devoted to these is taken up with futile points of contact between the two writers; whereas our critic, who was obviously in a hurry, would have been far better occupied in showing how profoundly they differ.

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are tackled (save for the Drama which is treated elsewhere) in 13 pages, of which more are devoted to Christine de Pisan (2½ pp.) than to Villon (2 pp.)—the latter one of the few really great lyric poets France has produced. Charles d'Orleans has to be content with 1½ pages, but it is some satisfaction to learn that his poems 'are the work of a dilettante of genius'; which is, after all, more than can be said for those of Christine, with all her endearing virtues and undoubted gifts. 'There is historical sentiment' in the *Ballade des dames des temps jadis* (which 'ranks among the most famous and most translated poems of French literature'); if so, it is a great lyric in spite of that circumstance. Mr Wright is on firmer ground when he admires the 'true religious feeling in the poem for his mother to Notre Dame[1].'

I trust I have not been unjust to this section of Mr Wright's book. I do not see that he has any sympathy with the Middle Ages, or that he understands them. If he has read the works he writes about—and there is no reason why he should not have done so, seeing that the leading examples only are dealt with—he has not carried any very definite impression away with him, and consequently he has not succeeded in making any very definite impression on his readers. These pages are obviously intended for beginners; and beginners, like children, should have only of the very best, by reason of their helplessness. The two books of Gaston Paris and his various essays remain the best introduction to the study of Old French literature.

H. Oelsner.

Oxford.

Victor Hugo, His Life and Work. By A. F. Davidson. London: Eveleigh Nash. 1912. 8vo. xiii + 351 pp.

Le regretté M. Davidson est mort avant d'avoir pu mettre la dernière main à cette monographie sur V. Hugo. Le manuscrit a été publié par les soins de M. Francis Gribble, qui n'y apporte que les corrections et additions strictement indispensables; elles sont d'ailleurs de peu d'importance.

Les 83 années de la vie de V. Hugo sont divisées ici en 21 périodes, ou tableaux, des diverses circonstances qu'ont traversées l'homme privé, l'homme de lettres et l'homme politique. On le suit pas à pas dans sa destinée; on déménage avec lui d'une résidence à l'autre; on le regarde

[1] This 'has been compared with Heine's *Wallfahrt nach Kevlaar*.' I fail to see that any useful purpose is served by this parallel.

vivre sa journée, on entend ses propos, privés ou publics; on voit s'additionner un à un les volumes de son œuvre et l'on perçoit l'écho du bruit qu'a fait en son temps chacun d'eux. Il y a là toute une moisson de petits faits authentiques, concrets, significatifs, pittoresques et amusants qui vous rendent le personnage vivant et familier, sans lui donner cependant sa physionomie vraie; en d'autres termes cette collection de détails réels ne crée pas une vérité d'ensemble, et la chronique des faits, gestes et paroles d'un *individu*, par certains côtés exceptionnel, par d'autres participant des défauts et travers de la commune humanité, n'est pas l'histoire, la véritable analyse psychologique d'une personnalité unique comme l'a été celle de V. Hugo.

M. Francis Gribble, dans une note-préface, présente l'ouvrage de M. Davidson comme "the most complete and at the same time the most impartial English study of V. Hugo." Le superlatif est relatif, évidemment.

Je voudrais expliquer en peu de mots ce qu'a d'un peu spécieux l'impartialité de M. D.—Sans doute il n'entonne ni dithyrambe ni réquisitoire; mais les nombreuses anecdotes, historiettes, exemples, qui révèlent les motifs et mobiles intéressés, dissimulés derrière les déclarations de parade, qui mettent en vedette les ridicules du bourgeois-gentil-homme-réformateur-apôtre-héros et quasi-demi-dieu, tiennent trop de place à côté de la simple et uniforme affirmation que V. Hugo avait du génie. M. Davidson les raconte alertement, avec humeur et une certaine complaisance, quitte à s'excuser ensuite, à l'occasion, de la façon que voici: "But why linger over these trifling details? Simply to postpone the inevitable truism that *Les Misérables* is a work of genius." Truisme, si l'on veut, c'est se contenter aisément que de dessiner d'un trait si maigre et si court les grands, beaux et bons côtés de V. Hugo, quand on insiste autant sur les autres. Quiconque a eu déjà un commerce direct avec l'œuvre elle-même, et c'est le cas de MM. Davidson et Gribble, ne se méprendra pas sur l'importance réelle de la partie anecdotique, mais les autres, tant de lecteurs des pays de langue anglaise qui, négligence ou faute de loisir, n'auront rien lu de V. Hugo avant d'aborder cette biographie, et qui s'en tiendront à elle? Ils seront incapables de juger équitablement ce qui ne leur aura pas été analysé et expliqué: la grandeur de l'œuvre et le développement d'un génie lyrique, épique et oratoire. Voilà en quoi l'étude de M. Davidson semble ne pas mériter d'être louée comme complète et impartiale. Il s'est tenu plus près d'un Edmond Biré que d'un Renouvier, d'un Brunetière, d'un Ernest Dupuy, qui, sans négliger de marquer les manifestations extérieures d'une activité littéraire et les circonstances, *causes occasionnelles* de telle ou telle production, ont cherché en outre à pénétrer les *raisons internes* du développement de l'œuvre de Hugo dans les divers genres, et de l'évolution de sa manière, à analyser ses puissances de conception, d'élaboration, d'expression, à discerner ce qu'il a reçu et acquis de ce qu'il a transformé et créé; la question de l'information, de la culture qu'un Hugo avait à son actif a plus d'importance que le chapitre de ses déplacements ou de ses polémiques personnelles.

M. Davidson aimait Mérimée, il sympathisait davantage avec son tempérament; il voulait écrire sa biographie; il a été détourné de ce projet et a entrepris d'écrire celle de Hugo, qu'il semble bien ne pas aimer foncièrement: ne se plaisant pas avec le génie de V. Hugo, il a pris son plaisir dans le récit des aventures et incidents de cette étonnante destinée; il en a fait une *Chronique biographique* de V. Hugo, adroite, amusante et instructive, dont on souhaiterait la traduction en français et en allemand, pour l'agrément du public de plusieurs autres pays[1].

HENRI CHATELAIN.

BIRMINGHAM.

Charles de Sainte-Marthe (1512—1555). By CAROLINE RUNTZ-REES. New York: Columbia University Press. 1910. 16mo. xiv + 664 pp.

Monographie abondante, bien informée, où l'auteur ne prétend pas réhabiliter cet écrivain de quatrième ordre, poète pauvre (les nombreuses citations au cours du texte et les extraits de *La Poesie Française* publiés en appendice en font foi), humble disciple de Marot, admirateur de Saint-Gelais et de Sahel, prosateur moins médiocre, en français, dans les Deux *Oraisons Funèbres* qu'il nous a laissées, de style plus simple en latin que beaucoup de ses contemporains; il nous intéresse par la part qu'il a prise dès le début dans le "mouvement pétrarquiste" et dans le "mouvement platonicien" de la première moitié du XVI^e^ siècle. Homme d'étude, il a absorbé la culture de son temps; avec son instruction considérable et son originalité minime, il sert de repoussoir aux grands noms du siècle; leurs personnalités en prennent plus de relief. Pour l'historien de la langue, la comparaison est amusante de sa prose avec celle des documents officiels qui l'avoisinent dans l'*Appendice*; elle est instructive quand on rapproche de ces textes celui de l'*Institution Chrestienne* de 1541.

Miss C. Runtz-Rees n'a pas pu toujours secourir aux documents et textes originaux, elle a dû citer l'Oraison Funèbre de la Reine de Navarre d'après la réimpression de Leroux de Lincy et Montaiglon. Etant données la valeur de l'auteur et l'importance de son œuvre, on n'a pas lieu de regretter ici l'absence d'un appareil minutieusement critique; on doit être reconnaissant à Miss C. Runtz-Rees d'avoir pris tant de peine, et d'avoir montré, par ce qu'elle a fait ici, quel parti elle eût pu tirer d'un meilleur sujet, de matériaux et d'instruments de travail plus accessibles[2].

HENRI CHATELAIN.

BIRMINGHAM.

[1] Quelques erreurs typographiques: p. 147, l. 9, lire *Mascarille*; p. 159, l. 10, lire *statesman*; p. 162, dernier quart, lire *Septembre* 4, 1843; p. 183, l. 20, lire *alliance*; p. 209, dernier quart, lire *Juliette*; p. 216, bas, lire *bric-à-brac*, etc.

[2] Pour l'orthographe et la ponctuation des textes cités, le système de l'éditeur, si l'on peut appliquer le mot système à sa combinaison-compromis, laisse assez à désirer; c'est d'autant plus regrettable qu'on voudrait, ayant les *Extraits* à l'appendice, n'avoir pas à recourir, pour ces mêmes textes, aux œuvres de l'auteur.

MINOR NOTICES.

An edition by Mr Nicol Smith is certain to be scholarly, and the volume entitled *Jeffrey's Literary Criticism* (Oxford, Frowde, 1910) is no exception to the rule. The introductory essay which prefaces it is pleasantly written, and lays stress upon points which are undoubtedly of value in estimating Jeffrey's literary criticism, and which do not always receive due attention. 'He skimmed along the surface of life doing a vast amount of work of one kind or another, and finding pleasure all the way, and from the vantage-ground of success he showed much personal kindness, but perhaps too little sympathy with disquietude of thought.' His nimbleness of mind combined with absolute honesty of judgment made his criticisms extraordinarily effective. His essays have not the insight or power of Coleridge's, they cannot rank as creative literature, but they are almost perfect examples of journalism, and of journalism at its very best. No one nowadays would want to sit down to a careful and detailed study of Jeffrey's 200 contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, but it is of real value to have the best of them collected into a single volume, that we may see for ourselves how the giants of the early nineteenth century appeared in the eyes of an exceedingly able contemporary.

G. E. H.

Among the publications of the University of Lund for the year 1911 is the text of *The Recluse*, a fourteenth century version of the *Ancren Riwle* edited by Joel Påhlsson. This version was first discovered by Miss A. C. Paues in a manuscript in the Pepysian library of Magdalene College, having been taken by Pepys himself to be a copy of some of 'Wickleef's' Sermons. The text is to be followed by a volume containing a survey of the phonology and inflections, notes and glossary. Comment on the work may be reserved until that volume appears, but in the meantime a cordial welcome may be given to the exceedingly careful work of another of those Swedish scholars who are now doing so much for Middle English studies.

A. M.

We welcome a new edition of Professor Jespersen's excellent *Growth and Structure of the English Language* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1912), to which since its first publication the Volney prize of the Institut de France has been awarded. The author says that he has here and there made slight alterations or additions, but that in the main the work remains unchanged. We have noted several cases in which sentences which were not quite clear in expression have been rewritten: one example is in § 107. Again, some felicitous illustrations have been added, among them (§ 147) the paraphrase of 'A rolling stone gathers no moss,' into

> Cryptogamous concretion never grows
> On mineral fragments that decline repose.

In general it may be said that there is no survey of the growth of the English language which more fully appreciates its variety and its vitality, and is more free from any pedantic idea of limiting its evolution by grammatical rules. If Professor Jespersen is sometimes a little 'previous,' and occasionally accepts or recommends words and expressions which have not yet established themselves in use, this is only what might have been expected from his openness of mind and liberality.

G. C. M.

We have before us the first of three volumes which are to contain all Manzoni's letters that are still in existence (*Carteggio di Alessandro Manzoni*, 1803—1821, a cura di Giov. Sforza e Giuseppe Gallavresi, Milano, Hoepli, 1912). It will be easier to value the net results of this publication when it is complete. It certainly widens our knowledge of Manzoni's character and vicissitudes. Straightforward, well-balanced and genially strong-willed as the poet was, his fame suffered much at the hands both of hero-worshippers and detractors. But with the passing of time his fame as a man and as an artist soared higher and higher. The printing of his letters is thus merely the payment of a tribute which posterity owed him. His nervous shyness would no doubt have caused him to resent the prying of the public into his private thoughts, but with the modern conception of the rights of posterity the wishes of great men are seldom considered. And Manzoni's life-story, with his deep religious crisis and his quiet but unflinching patriotism, has been told in so many different ways and looked upon from so many different standpoints, that none who is interested in Italian literature or in humanity at large will deprive himself of the pleasure of a complete insight into Manzoni's soul such as these letters provide. The letters here published are numerous, not a few almost irrelevant; but some are of supreme interest, and most are filled with the charm of this noble master's personality. Such patience of research has, during a long course of years, been bestowed upon the collection of the letters that very few, if any, can have escaped notice; the text has been collated, whenever possible, with the originals; and the editors have succeeded in explaining almost every reference, however cursory or obscure, so that the notes form a valuable guide to our knowledge of the literary circles of Lombardy and Paris.

C. F.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

September—November, 1912.

GENERAL.

Bulthaupt, H., Literarische Vorträge, aus dem Nachlass ausgewählt und durchgesehen von H. Kraeger. Oldenburg, Schulze. 4 M.

Rank, O., Das Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung und Sage. Vienna, F. Deuticke. 17 kr. 50.

Skeat, W. W., The Science of Etymology. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Italian.

Baretti, G., La scelta delle lettere familiari, a cura di L. Piccioni. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxvi.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Bartolucci, L., Appunti di letteratura italiana. i. Le origini. Rocca S. Casciano, L. Cappelli.

Berchet, G., Opere, a cura di E. Bellorini. ii. Scritti critici e letterari. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxvii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Carducci, G., Cantilene e ballate, strambotti e madrigali nei sec. xiii e xiv. Sesto S. Giovanni, Madella. 2 L.

Caterina da Siena, Santa. Libro della divina dottrina, volgarmente detto Dialogo della divina provvidenza. Nuova ediz. secondo un inedito codice senese, a cura di M. Fiorilli. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxiv.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Cesareo, G. A., La poesia di G. Pascoli. Bologna, Zanichelli. 1 L.

Croce, B., Scritti di storia letteraria e politica. ii. La rivoluzione napoletano del 1799. Bari, Laterza. 7 L.

D' Ancona, A., Scritti danteschi. Florence, Sansoni. 5 L.

Dante Alighieri, La divine comédie. Texte italien. Trad. introd. et notes par E. de Laminne. Paris, Perrin. 7 fr. 50.

Donati, A., Poeti minori del Settecento (Savioli, Pompei, Paradisi, Cerretti e altri). (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxiii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Filomusi, G. L., Novissimi studii su Dante. Siena, G. Bentivoglio. 3 L.

Flamini, F., Antologia della critica e dell' erudizione coordinata allo studio della storia letteraria italiana. Naples, F. Perrella. 4 L.

Francesco da Barberino. I documenti d' amore secondo i manoscritti originali a cura di F. Egidi. Fasc. x. Rome, E. Loescher. 5 L.

Gargiulo, A., Gabriele D' Annunzio. Studio critico. (Collezione Studi e ritratti, I.) Naples, Perrella. 4 L.

Guidiccioni, G., e Coppetta Beccuti, Rime a cura di E. Chiorboli. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxv.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Marchini, C. O., Goldoni e la commedia dell' arte. Naples, Perrella. 3 L.

Marotta, G., L' ideale mariano e la poesia in Italia nei secoli xiii, xiv e xv. Saggio storico-critico di letteratura religiosa. Mortara, A. Cortellezzi. 3 L.

Mattii, N., Teologia e Dante Alighieri. Montegiorgio, Finucci. 3 L.

McKenzie, K., Concordanza delle Rime di F. Petrarca. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 30*s.* net.

Monaci, E., Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli. Fasc. iii. Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 6 L.

Persico, T., Gli scrittori politici napoletani dal 1400 al 1700. (Nuova biblioteca di letteratura, storia ed arte, vi.) Naples, Perrella. 5 L.

Perticone, G., L' opera di G. Carducci. Saggio critico. Catania, N. Giannotta. L. 2.

Pellizzari, A., G. Chiarini : la vita e l' opera letteraria, con documenti inediti. (Collezione Studi e ritratti, ii.) Naples, Perrella. 3 L.

Rand, E. K. and E. H. Wilkins, Concordance to the Latin works of Dante. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 30*s.* net.

Segarizzi, A., Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato. Vol. i. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxvi.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Tassoni, A., La secchia rapita, con commento di P. Papini. Florence, Sansoni. 5 L.

Torraca, F., Studi danteschi. (Nuova biblioteca di letteratura, storia ed arte, vii.) Naples, Perrella. 5 L.

Verde, R., Studi sull' imitazione spagnuola nel teatro italiano del seicento. i. G. A. Cicognini. Catania, N. Giannotta. 2 L. 50.

Zingarelli, N., Le opere di G. Boccaccio scelte ed illustrate. Naples, Perrella. 3 L.

Zonta, G., Trattati d' amore del cinquecento. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxvii.) Barri, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Spanish.

Cervantes, M. de, El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha. iv. Edición y Notas de F. Rodriguez Marín. Madrid, Ediciones de 'La Lectura.' (Paris, Champion.)

Lope de Vega, L'Étoile de Séville, étude et version française intégrale, par C. Le Senne et G. de Saix. Paris, E. Sansot. 5 fr.

Lope de Vega, Las Burlas Veras. Comedia Famosa. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by S. L. Millard Rosenberg. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Romance Languages, Extra Series, No. 2.) Philadelphia.

Provençal.

Lavaud, R., Les troubadours cantaliens, xii^{e}—xiv^{e} siècles. Notes complémentaires critiques et explicatives sur les textes publiés dans l'ouvrage du Duc de La Salle de Rochemaure. Aurillac, Imp. Moderne. 4 fr. 50.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

ROUSTAN, M., La littérature française par la dissertation. Tome IV. Le moyen âge et le XIVe siècle. Paris, Delaplane. 3 fr.

SMITH, M. S. C., The spirit of French letters. London, Macmillan. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*b*) *Old French.*

KARL, L., Un moraliste bourbonnais du XIVe siècle et son œuvre. Le roman de Mardevie et les mélancolies de Jean Dupin. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.

Lancelot del Lac, Der altfranzösische Prosaroman von. II. Branche : Les enfances Lancelot (II. Teil). III. Branche : La doloreuse garde (I. Teil). Versuch einer kritischen Ausgabe von H. Bubinger. (Marburger Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie, VIII. Heft.) Marburg, A. Ebel. 5 M. 50.

MICHAUT, G., Aucassin et Nicolette, chant-fable du XIIe siècle, mise en français moderne. Préface de J. Bédier. Nouv. édition. Paris, Fontemoing. 2 fr. 50.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

BALZAC, H. DE, La comédie humaine. Texte revisé et annoté par M. Bouteron et H. Longnon. Tome IV. Paris, L. Conard. 9 fr.

BERTRAND, L., Gustave Flaubert, avec des fragments inédits. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

BOSSUET, Correspondance, nouvelle édition, augmentée de lettres inédites, publ. par Ch. Urbain et E. Levesque. Tome IV. Paris, Hachette. 7 fr. 50.

CAPPONI, G., J. J. Rousseau e la rivoluzione francese : saggio. (Biblioteca di filosofia e di pedagogia.) Genoa, Formiggini. 4 L.

CHATEAUBRIAND, Correspondance générale, publ. par L. Thomas. Tome II. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

DESCHARMES, R., et R. DUMESNIL, Autour de Flaubert, études historiques et documentaires, suivies d'une biographie chronologique, d'un essai bibliographique des ouvrages et articles relatifs à Flaubert. 2 vols. Paris, Mercure de France. 7 fr.

FLAKE, O., Der französische Roman und die Novelle. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 377.) Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1 M.

GIRAUD, V., Maîtres d'autrefois et d'aujourd'hui, essais d'histoire morale et littéraire. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

GRAN, G., Jean Jacques Rousseau. Edinburgh, W. Blackwood. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

LEDOS, E. G., Catalogue des ouvrages de J. J. Rousseau, conservés dans les grandes bibliothèques de Paris. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

REIK, TH., Flaubert und seine 'Versuchung des hl. Antonius.' Ein Beitrag zur Künstlerpsychologie. Minden, J. C. C. Bruns. 3 M.

REYNIER, G., Les origines du roman réaliste. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

ROLLAND, J., Les comédies politiques de Scribe. Paris, E. Sansot. 3 fr. 50.

SÉCHÉ, L., Le cénacle de Joseph Delorme (1827–30). Tome I. Victor Hugo et les poètes. Tome II. Victor Hugo et les artistes. Paris, Mercure de France. Each vol. 3 fr. 50.

SMITH, H. E., The Literary Criticism of Pierre Bayle. (Johns Hopkins Univ. Diss.) Albany, N.Y., Brandon Printing Co.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

Aasen, I., Skrifter i Samling, trykt og utrykt. 13.—18. Hefte. Kristiania, Gyldendal. Each 50 ö.

Björnson, B., Artikler og taler. Udgivet af Chr. Collin og H. Eitrem. 1.—2. Hefte. Kristiania, Gyldendal. Each 30 ö.

Boettcher, F., La femme dans le théâtre d'Ibsen. Paris, F. Alcan. 4 fr.

Gamalnorske Bokverk, utgjevne av Det norske samlaget (Landsmaalslaget). x. Soga um Óyrbyggjerne umsett fraa gamalnorsk ved J. Sverdrup. xii. Sverresoga fraa gamalnorsk ved H. Koht. Kristiania, Det norske Samlaget. 75 ö. and 40 ö.

Holberg, L., Samlede populære Skrifter. 12 Bind. Copenhagen, Madsen Lind. 3 kr. 10.

Jakobsen, J., Etymologisk Ordbog over det norröne Sprog fraa Shetland. 3. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Prior. 5 Kr.

Kierkegaard, S., Papirer. Udgune af P. A. Heiberg og V. Kuhr. iv. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 9 Kr. 75.

Knudsen, Chr., Dansk (og norsk-islandsk) Litteratur för 1500. Svendborg, P. Brandt. 1 Kr. 25.

Lyth, P. G., Tegnérs erotik och därmed sammanhängande själskriser. En förstudie. Stockholm, Skoglund. 1 Kr. 50.

Mortensen, J., Clas Livijns lyriska skriftställarskap. (Uppsala universitets Aarsskrift, 1913, i.) Uppsala, Akad. bokh. 3 Kr. 60.

Olsvig, V., L. Holbergs unge Dage. Med forskjellige Bidrag til det historiske Tidsbillede. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 10 Kr.

Poestion, J. C., Steingrimur Thorsteinsson, ein isländischer Dichter und Kulturbringer. Munich, G. Müller. 3 M. 50.

Rönning, F., N. F. S. Grundtvig. iii, 2. Copenhagen, Schönberg. 3 Kr.

Rosenberg, P. A., Herman Bang. (Mennesker i Litteraturens, Kunstens og Videnskabens Tjeneste, vii.) Copenhagen, Schönberg. 1 Kr. 50.

Skjaldedigtning, Den norsk-islandske, udgiven af Kommissionen for det arnamagnæanske Legat ved F. Jónsson. 3. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 Kr.

Strindberg, A., Samlade dikter. i.—iii. Stockholm, Bonnier. 2 Kr. 25, 1 Kr., 2 Kr. 25.

Sveriges National-litteratur, 1500—1900. vii. Sengustavianerna. 1700-talets dramatik, utg. af O. Sylwan. xx. A. Bondeson, O. Hansson, etc. Utg. af N. Erdmann. Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 2 Kr.

Dutch.

Bosboom-Toussaint, A. L. G., Verspreide novellen en geschriften, voor de eerste maal herdrukt. Ingeleid door J. Dyserinck. Rotterdam, D. Bolle. 1 fl. 90.

Diferee, H. C., Vondel's leven en kunstontwikkeling. Amsterdam, Van Holkema en Warendorf. 1 fl. 90.

Jonckbloet, G.. Jonkvrouwe Anna de Savornin Lohman in en uit hare werken. Leiden, G. F. Théonville. 90 c.

Liedboeken, Nederlandsche. Lijst der in Nederland tot het jaar 1800 uitgegeven liedboeken. Samengesteld onder leiding van D. F. Scheurleer. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 5 fl.

Scaecspel, Dat, uitgegeven door G. H. van Schaik Avelingh. (Bibliotheek van middelnederlandsche letterkunde.) Leiden, A. W. Sijthoff. 3 fl. 50.

Scholte, J. H., Een letterkundige overgangsvorm omstreeks 1700. Rede. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 60 c.

Vooys, C. G. N. de, De sociale roman en de sociale novelle in het midden van de negentiende eeuw. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 60 c.

Frisian.

Schmidt-Petersen, J., Wörterbuch und Sprachlehre der nordfriesischen Sprache nach der Mundart von Föhr und Amrum. Husum, C. F. Delff. 6 M.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Dixon, W. MacNeile, English epic and heroic poetry. London, Dent. 5*s.* net.

Lang, A., History of English Literature from 'Beowulf' to Swinburne. London, Longmans. 6*s.*

Morley, H., A First sketch of English Literature. New and enlarged edition. London, Cassell. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Saintsbury, G. A History of English Prose Rhythm. London, Macmillan. 14*s.* net.

Saintsbury, G., The Historical character of English Lyric. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Alexander, H. The Place-names of Oxfordshire. With a preface by H. C. Wyld. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, The. Edited from the translation in Monumenta Historica Britannica and other versions, by J. A. Giles. New edition. (Bohn's Libraries.) London, G. Bell. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Chaucer, G., Complete poetical works. Now first put into modern English by J. S. P. Tatlock and P. Mackaye. London, Macmillan. 15*s.* net.

Grein, C. W. M., Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter. Neu herausg. von J. J. Köhler. (Sammlung german. Elementar- und Handbücher, iv. Reihe. Wörterbücher, iv.) 5. und 6. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 1 M. 50.

Judith, Phœnix, and other Anglo-Saxon poems. Translated by J. L. Hall. London, Jarrold. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Old English Riddles. Edited by A. J. Wyatt. (Belles-Lettres Series.) Boston, Heath.

Patience, a West Midland poem of the 14th century. Edited with introduction, bibliography, notes and glossary by H. Bateson. Manchester, Sherratt and Hughes. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Pierquin, H., Recueil général des chartes anglo-saxonnes. Les Saxons en Angleterre (604–1061). Paris, Picard. 15 fr.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Rendered literally into modern English. Introduction etc. by J. B. Kirtlan. London, C. H. Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Weston, J. L., Romance, vision and satire. English alliterative poems of the 14th century, now rendered in the original metres. London, Nutt. 6*s.* net.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

ABERCROMBIE, L., Thomas Hardy. A critical study. London, Secker. 7*s.* *d.* net.

BECKFORD, W., The Episodes of Vathek. Translated by Sir F. T. Marzials. London, S. Swift. 21*s.* net.

BRADLEY, A. C., Coriolanus. Second annual Shakespeare lecture. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

BRIDGES, R., Poetical Works, excluding the eight dramas. London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

BROWN, H., Shakespeare's Patrons and other Essays. London, Dent. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

BROWNING, R., Works. Centenary Edition. V and VI. London, Smith, Elder. Each 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

BROWNING, R., The Ring and the Book. With an introduction by Edward Dowden. London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Browning Centenary, The. Royal Society of Literature. Reprinted from the Transactions. London, Royal Society of Literature. 3*s.* net.

BUCKLEY, J. A. and W. T. WILLIAMS, A Guide to British historical fiction. London, Harrap. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

CAIRNS, W. B., A History of American Literature. New York, Oxford Press. 6*s.* net.

CHAMBERS, E. R. and F. SIDGWICK, Early English Lyrics: amorous, divine, moral and trivial. New edition. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

CHEFFAUD, P. H., Georges Peele (1558—1596?). (Bibliothèque de philologie et de littérature modernes.) Paris, F. Alcan. 4 fr.

COLERIDGE, S. T., Complete poetical works. Including materials never before printed in any edition of the poems. Edited by E. H. Coleridge. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 16*s.* net.

COLERIDGE, S. T., Poems. Edited by E. H. Coleridge. (Oxford Edition.) London, Frowde. 2*s.*

CONGREVE, WILLIAM, The Double Dealer, The Way of the World, Love for Love, The Mourning Bride. With an introduction by William Archer. New York, American Book Company. 70 cents.

CRAWFORD, CH., The Marlowe Concordance. II. (Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas, XXXIV, 2.) Louvain, Uystpruyst. 25 fr.

CUNLIFFE, J. W., Early English classical tragedies. With Introduction and Notes. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

DELMER, F. S., A Key to spoken English. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Sidney Lee. Second Supplement. II. London, Smith, Elder. 15*s.* net.

DONNE, J., Poems. Edited from old editions and numerous MSS. with Introduction and Commentary by H. J. C. Grierson. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 18*s.* net.

DRINKWATER, J., William Morris, a critical study. London, Secker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

ELTON, O., A Survey of English Literature, 1780—1830. 2 vols. London, E. Arnold. 21*s.* net.

Essays and Studies by members of the English Association. Vol. III. Collected by W. P. Ker. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

FAIRCHILD, A. H. R., The Making of Poetry. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 5*s.* net.

FEHR, B., Streifzüge durch die neueste englische Literatur. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 3 M. 50.

GORDON, A. L., Poems. Edited by F. M. Robb. London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

GORDON, G. S., English Literature and the Classics. By various writers. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.

GOSSE, E., Portraits and Sketches. London, W. Heinemann. 6*s.* net.

GRAY, TH., Letters, including the Correspondence of Gray and Mason. Vol. III. (Bohn's Libraries.) London, G. Bell. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HALIFAX, George Savile, Marquess of, Complete Works. Edited by Walter Raleigh. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HELM, W. H., Charles Dickens. (Regent Library.) London, Herbert and Daniels. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

HIND, W. A., Browning's teaching on faith, life and love. London, G. Allen. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

How a man may chuse a good wife from a bad. Edited by A. E. H. Swaen. (Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas, XXXV.) Louvain, Uystpruyst. 10 fr.

JANKU, F., Adelaide Anne Procter, ihr Leben und ihre Werke. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXVIII.) Vienna, W. Braumüller. 3 Kr. 50.

KURE, J., Thomas Carlyle og hans Hustru. Et Rehabilitetsforsög. Copenhagen, Lybecker. 5 Kr.

LAMB, CH. and M., Letters. 2 vols. Edited by E. V. Lucas. (Works V and VI.) London, Methuen. Each 5*s.*

LANG, A., Shakespeare, Bacon and the Great Unknown. London, Longmans. 9*s.* net.

LIGHTWOOD, J. T., Charles Dickens and Music. London, C. H. Kelly. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

LOWELL, J. R., Poems. London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

LUTONSKY, P., A. H. Clough. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXIX.) Vienna, W. Braumüller. 2 Kr. 40.

MABIE, H. W., William Shakespeare, poet, dramatist and man. London, Macmillan. 2*s.* net.

MEREDITH, G., Letters, collected by his Son. 2 vols. London, Constable. 21*s.* net.

MEREDITH, G., Poetical Works. With some notes by G. M. Trevelyan. London, Constable. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

MORGAN, A. E., Scott and his Poetry. (Poetry and Life.) London, Harrap. 1*s.* net.

MORGANN, M., Essay on the dramatic character of Sir John Falstaff. Edited by W. A. Gill. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

NICOLL, Sir W. R., The Problem of 'Edwin Drood.' A study in the methods of Dickens. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

RENTON, R., John Forster and his friendships. London, Chapman and Hall. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

SADLER, M. T. H., The political career of R. B. Sheridan. Oxford, B. H. Blackwell. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SAINTSBURY, G., The Historical Character of the English Lyric. Third Warton Lecture. (British Academy.) London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* net.

SCHIRMER, W. F., Die Beziehungen zwischen Byron und Leigh Hunt. (Dissertation.) Freiburg, C. A. Wagner.

SHAKESPEARE, W., Complete Works. With a general introduction by A. C. Swinburne, etc. 3 vols. London, Frowde. Each 3*s.* net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., The Winter's Tale. Edited by F. W. Moorman. (Arden Edition.) London, Methuen. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SHARPHAM, E., The Fleire. Nach der Quarto 1607 herausgegeben von H. Nibbe. (Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas, XXXVI.) Louvain, Uystpruyst. 10 fr.

SIDGWICK, F., Popular ballads of the olden time. Fourth Series. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

SIM, F. M., R. Browning, the poet and the man. London, St Catherine Press. 2*s.* net.

SIMPSON, F. B., The R. L. Stevenson originals. Edinburgh, Foulis. 6*s.* net.

SIMPSON, H., A Century of Ballads, 1810—1910. London, Mills and Boon. 6*s.*

SPEARING, E. M., The Elizabethan translations of Seneca's Tragedies. Cambridge, Heffer. 2*s.* net.

THOMAS, E., George Borrow, the man and his books. London, Chapman and Hall. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

WALLACE, C. W., The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare. (Schriften der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft, IV.) Berlin, G. Reimer. 10 M.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

KAUFFMANN, F., Deutsche Metrik nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickl 3. Aufl. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 4 M. 50.

NORDSTRÖM, T., Studien über die Ausbildung der neuhochdeutschen starken Präsensflexion. (Diss.) Uppsala, Akad. bokh. 3 Kr.

SEILER, F., Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kultur im Spiegel des deutschen Lehnworts. IV. Teil. 2. Abschn. Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses. 8 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German* (*Old Saxon*).

BULTHAUPT, F., Milsträter Genesis und Exodus. Eine grammatisch-stilistische Untersuchung. (Palaestra, LXXII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 80.

JOSTES, F., Die Heimat des Heiland. Vortrag. (Forschungen und Funde, IV.) Münster, Aschendorff. 80 Pf.

KONRADS VON MEGENBERG Deutsche Sphaera, aus der Münchener Handschrift herausg. von O. Matthaei. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, XXIII.) Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M. 50.

MAI, E., Das mittelhochdeutsche Gedicht vom Mönch Felix philologisch untersucht und erklärt. (Acta Germanica, IV.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 15 M.

RIEMER, G. C. L., Wörterbuch und Reimverzeichnis zu dem Armen Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue. (Hesperia, III.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 3 M.

SCHNEIDER, H., Die Gedichte und die Sage von Wolfdietrich. Untersuchungen über ihre Entstehungsgeschichte. Munich, C. H. Beck. 15 M.

WOLTER, E., Das St. Galler Spiel vom Leben Jesu. Untersuchungen und Text. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XLI.) Breslau, M. und H. Marcus, 8 M. 60.

WUSTMANN, R., Walther von der Vogelweide. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 2 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Aellen, E., Quellen und Stil der Lieder Paul Gerhardts. Bern, Francke. 3 fr.

Andler, Ch., V. Basch, J. Benrubi, etc. La philosophie allemande au xix^e^ siècle. La philosophie des sciences historiques. Les grands courants de l'esthétique allemande contemporaine. (Bibl. de philosophie contemporaine.) Paris, F. Alcan. 5 fr.

Benzmann, H., Die soziale Ballade in Deutschland. Munich, C. H. Beck. 2 M. 80.

Brentano, Cl., Sämtliche Werke. Bd ix, 2. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

Brodnitz, K., Der junge Tieck und seine Märchenkomödie. Munich, Walhalla-Verlag. 2 M. 80.

Burdach, K., Faust und Moses. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad. der Wiss.) Berlin, G. Reimer. 6 M.

Cotterill, H. B., The Faust-legend and Goethe's 'Faust.' London, Harrap. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dahn, F., Gesammelte Werke. Neue wohlfeile Gesamtausgabe. 16 Bände. Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel. 64 M.

Eichendorff, J. von, Sämtliche Werke. iii. Munich, G. Müller. 4 M.

Farinelli, A., Hebbel e i suoi drammi. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, lxii.) Bari, G. Laterza. 4 L.

Frels, W., Bettina von Arnims Königsbuch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte ihres Lebens und ihrer Zeit. Schwerin, A. Schmidt. 2 M. 50.

Geiger, L., Goethe. Sein Leben und Schaffen. Berlin, Ullstein. 3 M.

Gräf, H. G., Goethe über seine Dichtungen. iii. Teil. Die lyrischen Dichtungen, i. (Des ganzen Werkes vii. Band.) Frankfort, Rütten und Löning. 20 M.

Grillparzer, F., Werke. Im Auftrage der Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien herausg. von A. Sauer. ii, Abt. ii. Vienna, Gerlach und Wiedling. 7 M. 20.

Grimmelshausen, H. J. C. von, The Adventurous Simplicissimus. London, Heinemann. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hartmann, A., Ludwig Uhland. Ein Volksbuch. Stuttgart, W. Spemann. 2 M.

Hebbel, F., Sämtliche Werke herausg. von P. Bornstein. ii. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.

Hebbel, F., Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe besorgt von R. M. Werner. i, Abt. v, vi. Berlin, B. Behr. Each 2 M. 50.

Hertz, W., Goethes Naturphilosophie in Faust. (Goethe-Bücherei.) Berlin, E. S. Mittler. 2 M. 50.

Hoffmann, E. T. A., im persönlichen und brieflichen Verkehr. Sein Briefwechsel und die Erinnerungen seiner Bekannten. Gesammelt und erläutert von H. von Müller. 2 Bände. Berlin, G. Paetel. 20 M.

Hölderlin, F., Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe unter Mitarbeit von F. Seebass besorgt durch N. von Hellingrath. v. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.

Humboldt, W. von, Gesammelte Schriften. ix. Band. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Berlin, B. Behr. 9 M. 50.

Korrodi, E., C. F. Meyer-Studien. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 3 M.

Kosch, W., Menschen und Bücher. Gesammelte Reden und Aufsätze. Leipzig, Dyk. 5 M. 50.

Kricker, G., Theodor Fontane. Von seiner Art und epischen Technik. (Bonner Forschungen, iv.) Berlin, G. Grote. 4 M.

Luther, M., Werke in Auswahl. Unter Mitwirkung von A. Leitzmann herausg. von O. Clemen. I. Band. Bonn, A. Marcus und E. Weber. 5 M.

Luther, M., Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. XXXVIII. Band. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 20 M. 40.

Luther, M., Tischreden. I. Band. Weimar, H. Böhlau. 21 M.

Lyncker, K. von, Am Weimarischen Hofe unter Amalien und Karl August. Erinnerungen. (Goethe-Bücherei.) Berlin, E. S. Mittler.

Maass, E., Goethe und die Antike. Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer. 12 M.

Mahrholz, W., Julius Mosens Prosa. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XLI.) Weimar, A. Duncker. 3 M. 60.

Meyer, F., Maler Müller-Bibliographie. Leipzig, F. Meyer. 14 M.

Meyer, R. M., Die deutsche Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts. Volksausgabe. Berlin, G. Bondi. 4 M. 50.

Meyer, R. M., Nietzsche. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Munich, C. H. Beck. 10 M.

Morris, M., Goethes und Herders Anteil an dem Jahrgang 1772 der Frankfurter gelehrten Anzeigen. 2. Aufl. Stuttgart, Cotta. 5 M.

Münnig, E., Calderón und die ältere deutsche Romantik. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M.

Petsch, R., Deutsche Dramaturgie von Lessing bis Hebbel. (Pandora, XI.) Munich, G. Müller und E. Rentsch. 2 M. 50.

Pniower, O., Dichtungen und Dichter. Essays und Studien. Berlin, S. Fischer. 5 M.

Puetzfeld, C., Heinrich Heines Verhältnis zur Religion. (Bonner Forschungen, III.) Berlin, G. Grote. 4 M.

Reichel, E., Gottsched. II. Band. Berlin, Gottsched-Verlag. 11 M. 50.

Richter, K. A., Shakespeare in Deutschland in den Jahren 1739—1770. Oppeln, H. Muschner. 4 M.

Rotter, C., Der Schnaderhüpfl-Rhythmus. Vers- und Periodenbau des ostälpischen Tanzlieds. (Palaestra, XC.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 8 M.

Schönemann, F., L. Achim von Arnims geistige Entwicklung, an seinem Drama 'Halle und Jerusalem' erläutert. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, XII.) Leipzig, H. Haessel. 6 M.

Sickel, P., F. Hebbels Welt- und Lebensanschauung. (Beiträge zur Ästhetik, XIV.) Hamburg, L. Voss. 6 M.

Stütz, F., Die Technik der kurzen Reimpaare des Pamphilus Gengenbach. (Quellen und Forschungen, CXVII.) Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 6 M.

Suchier, W., Gottscheds Korrespondenten. Alphabetisches Absenderregister. Berlin, Gottsched-Verlag. 6 M.

Till Eulenspiegel, herausg. von R. Benz. (Die deutschen Volksbücher.) Jena, E. Diederichs. 3 M.

Traumann, E., Goethes Faust. Nach Entstehung und Inhalt erklärt. I. Band. Munich, C. H. Beck. 6 M.

Vuilliod, A., La femme docteur. Mme Gottsched et son modèle française Bougeant. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, fasc. 23.) Paris, Fontemoing. 6 fr.

Wolff, J., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von J. Lauff. I. Serie. IV. und V. Bd. Leipzig, P. List. Each 3 M.

Wolff, E., Faust und Luther. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Faust-Dichtung. Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Wyneken, F. A., Rousseaus Einfluss auf Klinger. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology.) Berkeley. 1 dol.